arXiv:1609.06494v1 [math.DS] 21 Sep 2016

SYMBOLIC DYNAMICS FOR NON UNIFORMLY HYPERBOLIC DIFFEOMORPHISMS OF COMPACT SMOOTH MANIFOLDS

SNIR BEN OVADIA

Abstract. We construct countable Markov partitions for non-uniformly hyperbolic diffeomorphisms on compact manifolds of any dimension, extending earlier work of Sarig [Sar13] for surfaces.

These partitions allow us to obtain symbolic coding on invariant sets of full measure for all hyperbolic measures whose Lyapunov exponents are bounded away from zero by a constant. Applications include counting results for hyperbolic periodic orbits, and structure of hyperbolic measures of maximal entropy.

Contents

0. Introduction 1
0.1. Main results 1
0.2. Applications 2
0.3. Comparison to other results in the literature 2
0.4. Overview of the construction of the Markov partition 3
0.5. Reduction to the orientable case 3
0.6. Notations 3
0.7. Acknowledgements 3
1. Chains as pseudo-orbits 3
1.1. Pesin charts 3
1.2. Overlapping charts 10
1.3. ϵ-chains and infinite-to-one Markov extension of f 13
2. Regular chains which shadow the same orbit are close 27
2.1. The inverse problem for regular chains 27
2.2. Similar charts have similar manifolds 43
3. Markov partitions and symbolic dynamics [Bow78, Bow08, Sar13] 46
3.1. A locally finite countable Markov partition 46
References 49

0. Introduction

0.1. **Main results.** Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a directed graph with a countable collection of vertices $\mathcal{V}$ s.t. every vertex has at least one edge coming in, and at least one edge coming out. The topological Markov shift (TMS) associated to $\mathcal{G}$ is the set

$$\Sigma = \Sigma(\mathcal{G}) := \{(v)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{V}^{\mathbb{Z}} : v_i \to v_{i+1}\ \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

equipped with the left-shift $\sigma : \Sigma \to \Sigma$, $\sigma((v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}) = (v_{i+1})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, and the metric $d(u,v) := \exp(-\min\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : u_n \neq v_n \text{ or } u_{-n} \neq v_{-n}\})$. Thus Σ is a complete separable metric space. Σ is compact iff $\mathcal{G}$ is finite. Σ is locally compact iff every vertex of $\mathcal{G}$ has finite degree.

A subshift of the TMS is a subset of Σ which corresponds to a subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$ with the same properties, the same metric and equipped with the left-shift.

This work is a part of a M.Sc thesis at the Weizmann Institute of Science. The author was partly supported by the ISF grant 199/14.

For a given TMS Σ, we define:

$$\Sigma^{\#} := \{(v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \Sigma : \exists v', w' \in \mathcal{V}(\Sigma)\ ,\ \exists n_k, m_k \uparrow \infty \text{ s.t. } v_{n_k} = v'\ ,\ v_{-m_k} = w'\}$$

Notice that by the Poincaré recurrence theorem every σ-invariant probability measure gives $\Sigma^{\#}$ full measure. Furthermore, notice that every periodic point of σ is in $\Sigma^{\#}$.

Let f be a $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphism on a compact smooth boundary-less manifold M of a dimension greater than 1. Here $b \in (0,1)$ is the Hölder exponent of df.

We say that an ergodic f-invariant probability measure μ is a *hyperbolic measure*, if it has no zero Lyapunov exponents, and there are at least one positive and one negative exponent. For such a hyperbolic measure we define $\chi(\mu) := \min\{|\chi_i| : \chi_i \text{ is a Lyapunov exponent of } \mu\}$, and if $0 < \chi \leq \chi(\mu)$, we say μ is χ-hyperbolic. Similarly, we call a Lyapunon regular point in the manifold χ-hyperbolic, if its Lyapunov exponents are bounded away from 0 by χ.

Theorem 0.1.1. *For every $\chi > 0$ there exists a locally compact TMS Σ_χ, and a Hölder continuous map $\pi_\chi : \Sigma_\chi \to M$ s.t. :*

(1) $\pi_\chi \circ \sigma = f \circ \pi_\chi$

(2) $\pi_\chi[\Sigma_\chi^{\#}]$ is of full measure w.r.t any χ-hyperbolic measure; moreover, every point in $\pi_\chi[\Sigma_\chi^{\#}]$ has finitely many pre-images in $\Sigma_\chi^{\#}$.

Remark: Our bound for the Hölder exponent of π_χ decays to zero as $\chi \to 0$ (see the proof of proposition 1.3.20 and theorem 1.3.21). We denote the set of states of Σ_χ by $\mathcal{V}_\chi$.

Theorem 0.1.2. *For every χ-hyperbolic measure μ on M there is an ergodic σ-invariant probability measure $\hat{\mu}$ on Σ_χ, such that μ equals $\hat{\mu} \circ \pi_\chi^{-1}$ and they both have the same metric entropy.*

Remark: The correspondence of measures in theorem 0.1.2 is in-fact two-sided, we explain it briefly: if $\hat{\mu}$ is an ergodic σ-invariant probability measure on Σ_χ, then $\mu := \hat{\mu} \circ \pi_\chi^{-1}$ is an ergodic f-invariant probability measure on M, and μ has the same entropy as $\hat{\mu}$ because π_χ is finite-to-one on $\Sigma_\chi^{\#}$, which is of full $\hat{\mu}$-measure as argued. π_χ is into the set of χ-hyperbolic points, hence μ would be χ-hyperbolic as well.

Theorem 0.1.3. *For Σ_χ from theorem 0.1.1, there exists a function $\varphi_\chi : \mathcal{V}_\chi \times \mathcal{V}_\chi \to \mathbb{N}$ s.t. for every $x \in M$ which can be written as $x = \pi_\chi((v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})$ with $v_i = u$ for infinitely many negative i, and $v_i = w$ for infinitely many positive i: $|\pi_\chi^{-1}[\{x\}]| \leq \varphi_\chi(u, w)$.*

0.2. **Applications.**

Theorem 0.2.1. *Suppose f is a $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphism of a compact smooth boundary-less manifold of a dimension greater than 1, and suppose f has a hyperbolic measure which realizes the topological entropy. Then*

$$\exists p \in \mathbb{N} s.t. \liminf_{n\to\infty, p|n} e^{-nh_{top}(f)} P_n(f) > 0$$

where $P_n(f) := \#\{x \in M : f^n(x) = x\}$ and $h_{top}(f)$ is the topological entropy.

Theorem 0.2.2. *Suppose f is a $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphism of a compact smooth boundary-less manifold of a dimension greater than 1. Then f possesses at most countably many hyperbolic measures which realize the topological entropy.*

Theorems 0.2.1 and 0.2.2 follows from our main results as in [Sar13], see also [Kat07, Buz09]. Unlike in the case of surfaces, in dimension 3 and onwards it is not necessarily true that a measure of maximal entropy would be hyperbolic.

0.3. **Comparison to other results in the literature.**

Markov partitions for diffeomorphisms (defined as in [AW67, AW70, Sin68b, Bow70, Sar13]) were previously constructed for: Hyperbolic toral automorphisms [AW67], Anosov diffeomorphisms [Sin68b, Sin68a], pseudo–Anosov diffeomorphisms [FS79], Axiom A diffeomorphisms [Bow70, Bow71], and general diffeomorphisms of surfaces [Sar13]. For flows, see [Rat69, Rat73, Bow73, LS]. For maps with singularities, see [BS81, Lc].

This work treats the case of manifolds of a general dimension, for general diffeomorhpisms.

Katok's work shows that for a $C^{1+\beta}$ surface diffeomorphism f with positive entropy- $\forall \epsilon > 0 \ \exists$ a compact invariant subset Λ_ϵ s.t. $f : \Lambda_\epsilon \to \Lambda_\epsilon$ has a finite Markov partition, and $h_{top}(f|_{\Lambda_\epsilon}) > h_{top}(f) - \epsilon$. Typically, Λ_ϵ will have zero measure w.r.t. ergodic invariant measures with large entropy. This paper constructs a "horseshoe" ("Katok Horseshoes" are defined in [Kat80, Kat84],[KM95]) $\pi_\chi[\Sigma_\chi]$ with full measure for all hyperbolic measures (in the case of surfaces, positive entropy means hyperbolicty).

0.4. **Overview of the construction of the Markov partition.** Bowen's construction of Markov partitions for uniformly hyperbolic diffeomorhisms ([Bow78, Bow08]) uses Anosov's shadowing theory for pseudo-orbits. This theory fails for general non-uniformly hyperbolic diffeomorphisms. In dimension two, Sarig developed an alternative shadowing theory which does work in the non-uniformly hyperbolic setup. It consists of

(1) Definition of "ϵ-chains".
(2) shadowing lemma: every ϵ-chain "shadows" some orbit.
(3) Inverse problem: comparison of ϵ-chains which shadow the same orbit.

These properties, once established, allow the construction of Markov partitions using the method of Bowen ([Sar13]). Sarig worked in dimension two. We will generalize his work to the higher dimensional case. Most of the work is to obtain the fine Graph Transform needed for the shadowing lemma (§1.3.2) and the properties of the local stable and unstable manifold which are required to solve the inverse problem (§2.1 and §2.2).

Some parts of the argument require major changes of the two dimensional argument- we will give the details. In other parts (e.g. construction of Markov partitions given 1. , 2. and 3.) we will omit the details and give reference to the literature.

0.5. **Reduction to the orientable case.** Throughout this paper we assume that M is orientable- this assumption does not harm generality since an easy reduction can be made: One can look at the orientable double cover of M, denoted by $\widetilde{M}$. (Recall that $\widetilde{M}$ can be defined as a set by the collection of (x, o_x) where $x \in M$ and o_x is an orientation in x, or equivalently an equivalence class of bases for T_xM; $\widetilde{M}$ is equipped with the topology generated by the corresponding subset of $\widetilde{M}$ for every open, oriented subset of M). Hence one can define $\tilde{f}((x, o_x)) := (f(x), o(d_x f(b)))$ where b is some basis for T_xM from the equivalence class o_x, $o(b)$ is the equivalence class of a basis b. It is easy to see that in this case $\tilde{f}$ is invertible, and act locally like f, hence also in $\mathrm{Diff}^{1+\beta}(\widetilde{M})$ if f is in $\mathrm{Diff}^{1+\beta}(M)$.

0.6. **Notations.**

(1) For any normed vector space V, we will denote by $V(1)$ the unit sphere in V.
(2) We often write f-inv. in short for f-invariant; or ineq. in short for inequality; or const. for constant; Eq. in short for equation; or C.S for Cauchy-Schwarz.
(3) For a linear transformation L between two inner-product spaces V, W of finite dimension, the Frobenius norm is defined by $\|L\|_{Fr} = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}^2}$, where (a_{ij}) is the representing matrix for L, under the choice of some two orthonormal bases for V and W. This definition is proper.
(4) When an argument which is being made holds for two cases notated by different scripts, we write in short the two cases together, with the two scripts separated by a "/", respectively. For example, $\pi_\chi(u_{x/y}) = x/y$ means $\pi_\chi(u_x) = x$ and $\pi_\chi(u_y) = y$.

0.7. **Acknowledgements.** I would like to thank my advisor, Omri Sarig, for the patient guidance, encouragement and advice he has provided throughout my time as his student. I would also like to thank the Weizmann Institute for excellent working conditions. Finally, special thanks to Yakov Pesin and Yuri Lima for useful discussions.

1. Chains as pseudo-orbits

Let f be a $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphism of a smooth, compact and orientable boundary-less manifold M of dimension d.

1.1. **Pesin charts.**

1.1.1. *Non-uniform hyperbolicty.* By the Oseledec theorem, we get the splitting of T_xM, for any regular point (a point for which the Oseledec theorem holds), into subspaces $H_i(x)$ corresponding to the Lyapunov exponent $\chi_i(x)$. The splitting $T_xM = \oplus_{i=1}^{k(x)} H_i(x)$ can be used to diagonalize the action of df. Denote $dim(H_i(x)) = l_i(x)$. From the Oseledec theorem we also get the almost-everywhere (w.r.t any invariant measure) corresponding limit for the cocycle d_xf^n: $\Lambda(x) := \lim_{n\to\infty}((d_xf^n)^t d_xf^n)^{\frac{1}{2n}}$. Points for which this limit exists are called Lyapunov regular.

Definition 1.1.1.

(1) *For any Lyapunon regular $x \in M$, define $s(x) := \#\{\chi_i(x) < 0\}$, where $\chi_i(x)$ is the i-th smallest Lyapunov exponent at x.*

We will restrict ourselves for cases where $s(x) \in \{1, ..., d-1\}$- the hyperbolic case. The assumption of $s(x) \neq 0, d$ doesn't follow from the rest of our assumptions by the example of the linear map $z \mapsto 2z$ on the Riemann sphere, with the Dirac measure at 0. This would have only positive Lyapunov exponents, with 0 metric entropy for a smooth dynamical system.

(2) *The non-uniformly hyperbolic set of points is defined for every $\chi > 0$ as follows:*

$$NUH_\chi := \{x \in M | \exists \lim_{n\to\infty} ((d_xf^n)^t d_xf^n)^{\frac{1}{2n}}, \min\{|\chi_i(x)|\} > \chi, s(x) \in \{1, ..., d-1\}\}$$

Where χ_i are the Lyapunov exponents, given by the Oseledec theorem.

Notice that due to the fact that χ_i are f-inv. functions, χ_i are const. a.e. for every ergodic invariant measure.

(3) *We can thus define the following quantity for such measures which only depends on the measure (in oppose to depending on a point w.r.t to a measure):*

$$\chi(\mu) := \min\{|\chi_i| : \chi_i \text{ is a Lyapunov exponent of } \mu\}$$

Claim 1.1.2. *$\forall \mu$ an f-inv.and ergodic Borel probability measure such that $\chi(\mu) \geq \chi$: $\mu(NUH_\chi) = 1$*

Proof. Denote the set of points with for which Lyapunov values exist w.r.t μ by t_μ. By Oseledec theorem: $1 = \mu(t_\mu) \leq \mu(NUH_\chi)$ □

1.1.2. *Lyapunov change of coordinates.*

Definition 1.1.3.

- *For some point $x \in NUH_\chi$: $H^s(x) := \oplus_{i:\chi_i<0} H_i(x)$, $H^u(x) := \oplus_{i:\chi_i>0} H_i(x)$.*
- *For two linear vector spaces V and W, $GL(V, W)$ is the space of invertible linear transformations between V and W.*

Theorem 1.1.4. *Oseledec-Pesin ϵ-reduction theorem (*[Pes76]*):*

Let M be a compact Riemannian manifold. Then there exists a map $C_\chi : NUH_\chi \to GL(\mathbb{R}^d, T_xM)$ such that the map $D_\chi(x) = C_\chi^{-1}(f(x)) \circ d_xf \circ C_\chi(x)$ has the Lyapunov block form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} D_s(x) & \\ & D_u(x) \end{pmatrix}$$

Where $D_{s/u}(x)$ is an $s(x)\times s(x)/\, d-s(x)\times d-s(x)$ block (recall the notation from §0.6 section 4.), respectively. In addition, for every $x \in NUH_\chi$ we can decompose $T_xM = H^s(x) \oplus H^u(x)$ and $\mathbb{R}^d = \mathbb{R}^{s(x)} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{d-s(x)}$, and $C_\chi(x)$ sends each $\mathbb{R}^{s(x)/d-s(x)}$ to $H^{s/u}(x)$. Furthermore, $\exists \kappa(\chi, f)$ s.t.

$$\kappa^{-1} \leq \frac{|D_sv_s|}{|v_s|} \leq e^{-\chi}, \kappa \geq \frac{|D_uv_u|}{|v_u|} \geq e^{\chi}, \text{where } v_{s/u} \in \mathbb{R}^{s(x)/d-s(x)}$$

Proof. (Compare with [KM95] §S.2.10) Define:

$$\langle u, v\rangle'_{x,s} := 2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \langle d_xf^mu, d_xf^mv\rangle e^{2m\chi}, \text{ for } u, v \in H^s(x)$$

$$\langle u,v\rangle'_{x,u} := 2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\langle d_xf^{-m}u, d_xf^{-m}v\rangle e^{2m\chi},\ \text{for } u,v\in H^u(x)$$

Notice that for a fixed point $x\in NUH_\chi$, the sum converges locally-uniform ly on $H^s(x), H^u(x)$. Define:

$$\langle u,v\rangle'_x := \langle \pi_s u,\pi_s v\rangle'_{x,s} + \langle \pi_u u,\pi_u v\rangle'_{x,u} \tag{1}$$

where $u,v\in x_xM$, and $\pi_{s/u}: T_xM\to H^{s/u}(x)$ are the orthogonal projection

Choose measurably[1] $C_\chi(x): T_xM\to\mathbb{R}^d$ to be a linear transformation fulfilling $\langle u,v\rangle'_x = \langle C_\chi^{-1}(x)u, C_\chi^{-1}(x)v\rangle$ and $C_\chi[H^s(x)] = \mathbb{R}^{s(x)}$ (and hence $C_\chi[H^u(x)] = (\mathbb{R}^{s(x)})^\perp$). That means D_χ is in this block form since $C_\chi[H^s]\perp C_\chi[H^u]$ by definition of $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$. We get:

$$\langle d_xfv_s, d_xfv_s\rangle'_{f(x),s} = 2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_xf^{m+1}v_s|^2e^{2(m+1)\chi}e^{-2\chi} = e^{-2\chi}(\langle v_s,v_s\rangle'_{x,s} - 2|v_s|^2)$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\langle d_xfv_s, d_xfv_s\rangle'_{f(x),s}}{\langle v_s,v_s\rangle'_{x,s}} = e^{-2\chi}(1-\frac{2|v_s|}{\langle v_s,v_s\rangle'_{x,s}})$$

Call $M_f := \max_{x\in M}\{\|d_xf\|,\|d_xf^{-1}\|\}$ and notice $\langle v_s,v_s\rangle'_{x,s} > 2(|v_s|^2+|d_xfv_s|^2e^{2\chi}) \geq 2(|v_s|^2+M_f^{-2}|v_s|^2e^{2\chi})$, so:

$$\frac{\langle d_xfv_s, d_xfv_s\rangle'_{f(x),s}}{\langle v_s,v_s\rangle'_{x,s}} \in [\kappa^{-2}, e^{-2\chi}]$$

where $\kappa = \max\{e^\chi(1-\frac{1}{1+M_f^{-2}e^{2\chi}})^{-1/2}, e^\chi(1+M_f^2)^{1/2}\}$.

The same holds for D_u:

$$\langle d_xfv_u, d_xfv_u\rangle'_{f(x),u} = 2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_xf^{-m+1}v_u|^2e^{2(m-1)\chi}e^{2\chi} = e^{2\chi}(\langle v_u,v_u\rangle'_{x,u} + 2|d_xfv_u|^2e^{-2\chi})$$

and since $\langle v_u,v_u\rangle'_{x,u} > 2|v_u|^2$: $\frac{\langle d_xfv_u,d_xfv_u\rangle}{|v_u|'_{x,u}} < \frac{\langle d_xfv_u,d_xfv_u\rangle}{2|v_u|}$, we get:

$$\kappa^2 \geq \frac{\langle d_xfv_u, d_xfv_u\rangle'_{f(x),u}}{\langle v_u,v_u\rangle'_{x,u}} \geq e^{2\chi}$$

Let $w_s\in\mathbb{R}^{s(x)}$, and define $v_s := C_\chi(x)w_s$:

$$\frac{|D_s(x)w_s|^2}{|w_s|^2} = [w_s = C_\chi^{-1}(x)v_s] = \frac{|C_\chi^{-1}(f(x))d_xfv_s|^2}{|C_\chi^{-1}(x)v_s|^2} = \frac{|d_xfv_s|'^2_{f(x),s}}{|v_s|'^2_{x,s}} \in [\kappa^{-2}, e^{-2\chi}]$$

The same way goes to show that $\frac{|D_u(x)w_u|^2}{|w_u|^2}\in[e^{2\chi},\kappa^2]$. □

Claim 1.1.5. *$D_\chi(x)$ extends to a cocycle the following way:*

$$D_\chi(x,n) = C_\chi(f^n(x))^{-1}\circ d_xf^n\circ C_\chi(x)$$

D_χ and df have the same Lyapunov spectrum.

Proof. See e.g. [KM95], last part of theorem S.2.10. □

Claim 1.1.6.

$$\lim_{n\to\pm\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\|C_\chi^{\pm1}(f^n(x))\| = 0\ a.e.$$

[1] By the orientability of M, there exist a measurable family of positively oriented and orthonormal (w.r.t to the Riemannian metric) bases of T_xM, $(\tilde{e_1}(x),...,\tilde{e_d}(x))$. Using projections to $H^{s/u}(x)$ (which are defined measurably), and the Gram-Schmidt process, we construct orthonormal bases for $H^{s/u}(x)$ in a measurable way, w.r.t to $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle'_{x,s/u}$. Denote these bases by $\{b_i(x)\}_{i=1}^{s(x)}$ and $\{b_i(x)\}_{i=s(x)+1}^{d}$, respectively. Define $C_\chi^{-1}(x): b_i(x)\mapsto e_i$, where $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is the standard basis for $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. $C_\chi^{-1}(f^n(x)) = D_\chi(x,n)\cdot C_\chi^{-1}(x)\cdot d_x f^{-n}$, So:

$$\overline{\lim_{n\to\pm\infty}}\frac{1}{|n|}\log\|C_\chi^{-1}(f^n(x))\| \le \overline{\lim_{n\to\pm\infty}}\frac{1}{|n|}\log\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\| = 0$$

($\because$ the spectra of D_χ and df are equal and cancel each other)

And by remembering $\|C_\chi^{-1}(\cdot)\| \ge 1$ we get that the limit-inferior of the same expression is greater or equal to zero.

By $C_\chi(x) = d_x f^{-n}\cdot C_\chi(f^n(x))\cdot D_\chi(x,n)$ we get the other sided ineq. for $C_\chi(f^n(x))$. Similar arguments are being done for the $liminf$ and $limsup$ of $\|C_\chi(x)\|$. □

Theorem 1.1.7. *There exists an $F_0 > 0$ only depending on f, χ and M such that:*

$$\frac{\|C_\chi^{-1}(f(x))\|}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|} \in [F_0^{-1}, F_0]$$

Proof.

$$\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^2 = \sup_{\xi\in H^s(x),\eta\in H^u(x)}\frac{S^2(x,\xi)+U^2(x,\eta)}{|\xi+\eta|^2}$$

where, $|\cdot|$- when applied on a tangent vector at x- is the Riemannian norm on T_xM, and

$$S^2(x,\xi) = 2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_x f^m\xi|^2 e^{2\chi m}, U^2(x,\xi) = 2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_x f^{-m}\eta|^2 e^{2\chi m}.$$

Claim 1: For a fixed $x \in NUH_\chi$ the RHS expression is continuous in ξ, η.

Proof: The norms of vectors clearly are. So we are left to show continuity for S^2, and it's done similarly for U^2: Denote $S^2(x) = \sup_{v\in H^s(x)(1)} S^2(x,v)$ (recall $H^s(x)(1)$ =unit ball in $H^s(x)$). We first show that $S^2(x)$ is finite: Choose some orthonormal basis $(g_i)_i$ for (for an instance) $H^s(x)$, and let $v \in H^s(x)(1)$, then $v = \sum^{s(x)} a_i g_i$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\langle d_x f^m v, d_x f^m v\rangle e^{2\chi m} = \sum_{i,j} a_i a_j \sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\langle d_x f^m g_i, d_x f^m g_j\rangle e^{2\chi m}\\
&\le (\sum_{i,j}|a_i||a_j|)\max_{i,j}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\langle d_x f^m g_i, d_x f^m g_j\rangle e^{2\chi m}\\
&\le d^2|\vec{a}|_\infty^2\max_{i,j}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_x f^m g_i|e^{\chi m}|d_x f^m g_j|e^{\chi m}(\because \text{C.S ineq.})\\
&\le d^2 const.^2\cdot\max_{i,j}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_x f^m g_i|e^{\chi m}|d_x f^m g_j|e^{\chi m}(\because |\vec{a}|_\infty \le \sqrt{d}\cdot|\vec{a}|_2, and |\vec{a}|_2 = 1) \qquad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\vec{a}|_\infty = \max_i\{|a_i|\}$. The sum in (2) is finite because we know that $\limsup\frac{1}{m}\log|d_x f^m g_i| \le \chi_{s(x)}(x) < -\chi$, so there are some functions $c_i(x)$ s.t. $|d_x f^m g_i| \le c_i\cdot e^{m\frac{1}{2}(\chi+\chi_1(x))}$ for all m. Substituting these completes the proof that $S^2(x)$ is finite. Now for continuity, denote $v = u + h$, then

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_x f^m v|^2 e^{2\chi m} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_x f^m u|^2 e^{2\chi m} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_x f^m h|^2 e^{2\chi m} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\langle d_x f^m u, d_x f^m h\rangle e^{2\chi m}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_xf^mv|^2e^{2\chi m}-\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_xf^mu|^2e^{2\chi m}\Big| \leq & |h|^2\frac{1}{2}S^2(x)+\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_xf^mu||d_xf^mh|e^{2\chi m} \ (\because \text{ C.S ineq.})\\ =&|h|^2\frac{1}{2}S^2(x)+\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_xf^mu|e^{\chi m}|d_xf^mh|e^{\chi m} \leq (\text{ again by C.S ineq.})\\ \leq&|h|^2\frac{1}{2}S^2(x)+|h|\sqrt{\Big(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_xf^mu|^2e^{2\chi m}\Big)\cdot\Big(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_xf^m\frac{h}{|h|}|^2e^{2\chi m}\Big)}\\ \leq&(|h|^2+|h|)\frac{1}{2}S^2(x)\xrightarrow[h\to 0]{}0\end{aligned}$$

and this concludes claim 1.

A continuous function on a compact set achieves its maximum. So denote by ξ and η the tangent vectors that achieve the maximum at the point $f(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\|C_\chi^{-1}(f(x))\|^2}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^2}=&\frac{\sup_{\xi_1,\eta_1}(S^2(f(x),\xi_1)+U^2(f(x),\eta_1))/|\xi_1+\eta_1|^2}{\sup_{\xi_2,\eta_2}(S^2(x,\xi_2)+U^2(x,\eta_2))/|\xi_2+\eta_2|^2}\\ \leq&\frac{\sup_{\xi_1,\eta_1}(S^2(f(x),\xi_1)+U^2(f(x),\eta_1))/|\xi_1+\eta_1|^2}{(S^2(x,d_{f(x)}f^{-1}\xi)+U^2(x,d_{f(x)}f^{-1}\eta))/|d_{f(x)}f^{-1}\xi+d_{f(x)}f^{-1}\eta|^2}\\ =&\frac{S^2(f(x),\xi)+U^2(f(x),\eta)}{S^2(x,d_{f(x)}f^{-1}\xi)+U^2(x,d_{f(x)}f^{-1}\eta)}\cdot\frac{|d_{f(x)}f^{-1}\xi+d_{f(x)}f^{-1}\eta|^2}{|\xi+\eta|^2}\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

Claim 2: The left fraction of (3) is bounded away from 0 and ∞ uniformly by a constant (and its inverse) depending only on f, M and χ.

Proof:

$$S^2(f(x),d_xfv)=2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_{f(x)}f^md_xfv|^2e^{2\chi m}=\Big(2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}|d_xf^mv|^2e^{2\chi m}-2\Big)e^{-2\chi}=e^{-2\chi}(S^2(x,v)-2).$$

Thus, this, together with noticing that $S^2(f(x),d_xfv)>2$, gives

$$\frac{1}{1+e^{-2\chi}}e^{-2\chi}S^2(x,v)<S^2(f(x),d_xfv)<e^{-2\chi}S^2(x,v)$$

A similar calculation is done for U, and this is enough to write the terms in the numerator with those of the denominator times an independent constant.

Claim 3: The right fraction of (3) is bounded away from 0 and ∞ uniformly by a constant (and its inverse) depending only on f, M and χ.

Proof: By recalling that $M_f:=\max_{x\in M}\{\|d_xf\|,\|d_xf^{-1}\|^{-1}\}$, we get

$$\frac{|d_{f(x)}f^{-1}\xi+d_{f(x)}f^{-1}\eta|^2}{|\xi+\eta|^2}=\frac{|d_{f(x)}f^{-1}(\xi+\eta)|^2}{|\xi+\eta|^2}\in[M_f^{-2},M_f^2]$$

The three claims together complete the upper bound for the theorem. By choosing the vectors ξ,η to maximize the denominator instead, we get a lower bound. □

Lemma 1.1.8. *Let $(X,\mathcal{B},\mu,T)$ be a probability preserving transformation (p.p.t). Let $f:X\to GL_d(\mathbb{R})$ be a measurable function. Then for almost every $x\in X$ there exists a subsequence of the naturals, $n_k\uparrow\infty$, s.t. $f(T^{n_k}x)\xrightarrow[k\to\infty]{\|\cdot\|}f(x)$.*

Proof. See [Aar97], theorem 1.1.5.

□

Definition 1.1.9.

$$NUH_\chi^*:=\{x\in NUH_\chi:\exists n_k\to\infty,m_k\to\infty \text{ s.t. } C_\chi(f^{n_k}x),C_\chi(f^{-m_k}x)\to C_\chi(x)\}$$

By lemma 1.1.8 (with $GL(\mathbb{R}^d, T_xM)$ instead of $GL_d(\mathbb{R})$, due to the fact $GL(\mathbb{R}^d, T_xM)$ is metric and seperable w.r.t the desired topology), this set is of full measure. This is the set we will work with from now on.

Claim 1.1.10.

$$\lim_{n\to\pm\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log|\det C_\chi(f^n x)| = 0$$

Proof. Let $x \in NUH^*_\chi$: $C^{\pm1}_\chi(f^{n_k}(x))$ are bounded along n_k, and hence $|C^{-1}_\chi(f^{n_k}(x))d_xf^{n_k}C_\chi(x)u| \asymp |d_xf^{n_k}C_\chi(x)u|$. So the following Lyapunov limits agree:

- $\lim_{n\to\pm\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log|d_xf^nC_\chi(x)u|$
- $\lim_{n\to\pm\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log|C^{-1}_\chi(f^n(x))d_xf^nC_\chi(x)u|$

and the Lyapunov spaces are: $H^{(\chi)}_i(x) = C^{-1}_\chi(x)[H_i(x)]$. (We already knew the Lyapunov exponents are the same)

$$\Rightarrow \Lambda_\chi(x) := C^{-1}_\chi(x)\Lambda(x)C_\chi(x) \Rightarrow \det\Lambda(x) = \det\Lambda_\chi(x)$$

We will start by noticing that:

$$|\det d_xf^n| = \sqrt{\det[(d_xf^n)^t d_xf^n]} = \sqrt{(\det\Lambda(x))^{2n}\cdot e^{o(n)}} = \sqrt{(\det\Lambda_\chi(x))^{2n}\cdot e^{o(n)}} =$$

$$= \sqrt{\det[D_\chi(x,n)^t D_\chi(x,n)]\cdot e^{o(2n)}} = |\det D_\chi(x,n)|\cdot e^{o(n)}$$

So we get:

$$\lim_{n\to\pm\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log|\det d_xf^n| = \lim_{n\to\pm\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log|\det D_\chi(x,n)| =$$

$$= \lim_{n\to\pm\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log|\det(C^{-1}_\chi(f^n(x))d_xf^nC_\chi(x))| =$$

$$= \lim_{n\to\pm\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log|\det d_xf^n| + \lim_{n\to\pm\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log|\det C^{-1}_\chi(f^n(x))| \Rightarrow \lim_{n\to\pm\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log|\det C^{-1}_\chi(f^n(x))| = 0$$

□

Lemma 1.1.11. *C_χ is a contraction.*

Proof. $\forall v_{s/u} \in H^{s/u}$: $|C^{-1}_\chi(x)v_{s/u}|^2 = |v_{s/u}|^2_{x,s/u} > 2|v_{s/u}|^2$.

Hence, $\forall w \in \mathbb{R}^d : w = w_s + w_u$:

$$|C_\chi(x)w|^2 = (|C_\chi(x)w_s| + |C_\chi(x)w_u|)^2 < (\frac{1}{2}(|w_s| + |w_u|))^2 \le (|w_s + w_u|)^2$$

The last inequality is due to the fact that $w_s \perp w_u$. □

1.1.3. *Pesin charts.* Let $\exp_x : T_xM \to M$ be the exponential map. Since M is compact, there exist $r, \rho > 0$ s.t. $\forall x \in M$ $\exp_x$ maps $B^x_{\sqrt{d}\cdot r} = \{v \in T_xM : |v|_x < \sqrt{d}\cdot r\}$ diffeomorphically onto a neighborhood of $B_\rho(x) = \{y \in M : d(x,y) < \rho\}$, where $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the distance function on $M \times M$, w.r.t to the Riemannian metric.

Definition 1.1.12.

(a) *$B_\eta(0), R_\eta(0)$ are open balls located at the origin with radius η in $\mathbb{R}^d$ w.r.t Euclidean norm and supremum norm respectively.*

(b) *We take ρ so small that $(x,y) \mapsto \exp^{-1}_x(y)$ is well defined and 2-Lipschitz on $B_\rho(z) \times B_\rho(z)$ for $z \in M$, and so small that $\|d_y\exp^{-1}_x\| \le 2$ for all $y \in B_\rho(x)$.*

(c)

$$\psi_x := \exp_x \circ C_\chi(x) : R_r(0) \to M$$

Since $C_\chi(x)$ is a contraction, ψ_x maps $R_r(0)$ diffeomorphically into M.

(d)

$$f_x := \psi^{-1}_{f(x)} \circ f \circ \psi_x : R_r(0) \to \mathbb{R}^d$$

Then we get $d_0f_x = D_\chi(x)$ (c.f. theorem 1.1.4).

(e) $\forall \epsilon > 0 : I_\epsilon := \{e^{-\frac{1}{3}\ell\epsilon}\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\tilde{Q}_\chi(x) := \frac{1}{3^{6/\beta}}\epsilon^{\frac{90}{\beta}}\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^{\frac{-48}{\beta}}$

$$Q_\epsilon(x) := \max\{q \in I_\epsilon | q \le \tilde{Q}_\chi(x)\}$$

This definition is a bit different than Sarig's, and will come in handy in some arithmetics later on.

Remark: Depending on context, the notations of (a) will be used to describe balls with the same respective norms in some subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$- usually $\mathbb{R}^{s(x)}$ or its orthogonal complement, for some $x \in NUH_\chi(f)$. $B_r^x(v) := \{w \in T_xM : |v - w| < r\}$.

Theorem 1.1.13. *(Compare with* [BP07]*, theorem 5.6.1) For all ϵ small enough, and $x \in NUH_\chi^*$:*

(1) $\psi_x(0) = x$ and $\psi_x : R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0) \to M$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image s.t. $\|d_u\psi_x\| \le 2$ for every $u \in R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$.
(2) f_x is well defined and injective on $R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$, and
  (a) $f_x(0) = 0, d_0f_x = D_\chi(x)$.
  (b) $\|f_x - d_0f_x\|_{C^{1+\beta/2}} \le \epsilon$ on $R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$.
(3) The symmetric statement holds for f_x^{-1}.

Proof. This proof is similar to Sarig's [Sar13], theorem 2.7; up to a change of a few constants to fit the general dimension d case.

□

Definition 1.1.14. *Suppose $x \in NUH_\chi^*$ and $\eta \in (0, Q_\epsilon(x)]$, then the Pesin Chart ψ_x^η is the map $\psi_x : R_\eta(0) \to M$. Recall, $R_\eta(0) = [-\eta, \eta]^d$.*

Lemma 1.1.15. *For all ϵ small enough:*

(1) $Q_\epsilon(x) < \epsilon^{3/\beta}$ on NUH_χ^*.
(2) $\|C_\chi^{-1}(f^i(x))\|^{48} < \epsilon^{2/\beta}/Q_\epsilon(x)$ for i=-1,0,1.
(3) For all $t > 0$ $\#\{Q_\epsilon(x) | Q_\epsilon(x) > t, x \in M\} < \infty$
(4) $\exists\omega_0$ depending only on χ, M and f s.t. $\omega_0^{-1} \le Q_\epsilon \circ f/Q_\epsilon \le \omega_0$ on NUH_χ^*.
(5) $\exists q_\epsilon : NUH_\chi^* \to (0, 1)$ s.t. $q_\epsilon \le \epsilon \cdot Q_\epsilon$ and $e^{-\epsilon} \le \frac{q_\epsilon \circ f}{q_\epsilon} \le e^\epsilon$

Proof. (1) Clear by definition of $\tilde{Q}_\epsilon(x)$.

(2)$\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^{48} = \tilde{Q}_\epsilon^{-\beta}(x) \cdot \frac{1}{3^{6/\beta}}\epsilon^{90} \le \epsilon^3/Q_\epsilon^\beta(x) = \epsilon^{2/\beta}/Q_\epsilon(x) \cdot \frac{\epsilon^{3-2/\beta}}{Q_\epsilon^{\beta-1}(x)} = \epsilon^{2/\beta}/Q_\epsilon(x) \cdot \frac{(\epsilon^{3\beta-2})^{1/\beta}}{Q_\epsilon^{\beta-1}(x)} =$

$= \epsilon^{2/\beta}/Q_\epsilon(x) \cdot \left(\frac{\epsilon^{3/\beta}}{Q_\epsilon(x)}\right)^{\beta-1} \cdot \epsilon^{1/\beta}$

Hence by part (1) and the fact that $\beta < 1$:

$$\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^{48} < \left(\epsilon^{2/\beta}/Q_\epsilon(x)\right) \cdot \epsilon^{1/\beta}.$$

Using part (4), and noticing $\epsilon^{1/\beta} < F_0^{-1}$ (for small enough ϵ; recall F_0 from theorem 1.1.7):

$$\|C_\chi^{-1}(f^i x)\|^{48} < \epsilon^{2/\beta}/Q_\epsilon(x) \text{ where i=-1,0,1}$$

(3) For all $t > 0$: $\{Q_\epsilon(x) | Q_\epsilon(x) > t, x \in M\} \subset \{e^{-\epsilon l\frac{1}{3}}\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}} \cap (t, \epsilon^{3/\beta}]$

(4) By theorem 1.1.7: $F_0^{-1} \le \frac{\|C_\chi^{-1}(f(x))\|}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|} \le F_0$ on NUH_χ^*. Now $\tilde{Q}_\epsilon(x) = (\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|)^{-48/\beta}\epsilon^{90/\beta}\frac{1}{3^{6/\beta}}$ hence

$$\frac{\tilde{Q}_\epsilon(f(x))}{\tilde{Q}_\epsilon(x)} \in [F_0^{-48/\beta}, F_0^{48/\beta}]$$

By definition of $Q_\epsilon(x)$: $Q_\epsilon \in (e^{-\epsilon/3}\tilde{Q}_\epsilon, \tilde{Q}_\epsilon]$, hence

$$e^{-\epsilon/3}F_0^{-48/\beta} \le Q_\epsilon \circ f/Q_\epsilon \le F_0^{48/\beta}$$

And $\omega_0 := e^{\epsilon/3}F_0^{48/\beta}$.

(5) By claim 1.1.6 $\lim \frac{1}{n}\log \tilde{Q}_\epsilon(f^n(x)) = 0$, and hence by the fact seen in (4) that $Q_\epsilon(x) \in (e^{-\epsilon}\tilde{Q}_\epsilon(x), \tilde{Q}_\epsilon(x)]$ we get also $\lim \frac{1}{n}\log Q_\epsilon(f^n(x)) = 0$.

$$\frac{1}{q_\epsilon(x)} := \frac{1}{\epsilon}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{-|k|\epsilon}\frac{1}{Q_\epsilon(f^k(x))}$$

The sum converges because $\frac{1}{k}\log Q_\epsilon(f^k(x)) \xrightarrow[k\to\pm\infty]{} 0$, ands it's easy to check that the sum behaves as we wish, by Pesin's Tempering Kernel Lemma [BP07], lemma 3.5.7). □

Lemma 1.1.16. *Let $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ be a p.p.t . Let $q : X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a measurable function. Then the set $\{x \in X : \overline{\lim} q(T^n x) > 0\}$ is of full measure.*

Proof. $A_m := \{x : q(x) \in [2^{-m}, 2^{-m+1})\}, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. So by Poincaré's recurrence theorem:

$$B_m := \{x \in A_m : \#\{n : T^n x \in A_m\} = \infty\} \subset A_m \Rightarrow \mu(A_m) = \mu(B_m).$$

Notice that $B_m \cap B_k = \phi$ since $A_m \cap A_k = \phi$ for $m \neq k$. We got $X = \bigcup\limits_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} B_m \bmod \mu$, and for all $x \in B_m$: $\overline{\lim} q(T^n x) \geq 2^{-m} > 0$. □

Definition 1.1.17.

$$NUH_\chi^\# := \{x \in NUH_\chi^* | \limsup_{n\to\infty} q_\epsilon(f^n(x)), \limsup_{n\to\infty} q_\epsilon(f^{-n}(x)) > 0\}.$$

By the previous lemma, the above set is of full measure. This is the set we will be interested in from now on.

1.2. **Overlapping charts.**

1.2.1. *The overlap condition.* The following defintion is from [Sar13], §3.1.

Definition 1.2.1.

(a) *For every $x \in M$ there's an open neighborhood D of diameter less than ρ and a smooth map $\Theta_D : TD \to \mathbb{R}^d$ s.t.:*
  (1) *$\Theta_D : T_xM \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a linear isometry for every $x \in D$*
  (2) *Define $\nu_x := \Theta_D|^{-1}_{T_xM} : \mathbb{R}^d \to T_xM$, then $(x, u) \mapsto (\exp_x \circ \nu_x)(u)$ is smooth and Lipschitz on $D \times B_2(0)$ w.r.t the metric $d(x, x') + |u - u'|$*
  (3) *$x \mapsto \nu_x^{-1} \circ \exp_x^{-1}$ is a Lipschitz map from D to $C^2(D, \mathbb{R}^d) = \{C^2 - \text{maps from } D \text{ to } \mathbb{R}^d\}$*
  Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a finite cover of M by such neighborhoods. Denote with $\lambda(\mathcal{D})$ the Lebesgue number of that cover. Hence if $d(x, y) < \lambda(\mathcal{D})$ then x and y belong to the same D for some D.

(b) *We say two Pesin charts $\psi^{\eta_1}_{x_1}, \psi^{\eta_2}_{x_2}$ $\epsilon-$*overlap *if $e^{-\epsilon} < \frac{\eta_1}{\eta_2} < e^\epsilon$, and for some $D \in \mathcal{D}$: $x_1, x_2 \in D$; and also $d(x_1, x_2) + \|\Theta_D \circ C_\chi(x_1) - \Theta_D \circ C_\chi(x_2)\| < \eta_1^4\eta_2^4$*

***Remark**: The overlap condition is symmetric and monotone: if $\psi^{\eta_i}_{x_i}$ $\epsilon-$overlap, then also $\psi^{\xi_i}_{x_i}$ for all $\eta_i \leq \xi_i \leq Q_\epsilon(x_i)$ s.t. $e^{-\epsilon} < \frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} < e^\epsilon$.*

Proposition 1.2.2. *The following holds for all ϵ small enough: If $\psi_x : R_\eta(0) \to M$ and $\psi_y : R_\zeta(0) \to M$ ϵ-overlap, then:*

(1) *$\psi_x[R_{e^{-2\epsilon}\eta}(0)] \subset \psi_y[R_\zeta(0)]$ and $\psi_y[R_{e^{-2\epsilon}\zeta}(0)] \subset \psi_x[R_\eta(0)]$*
(2) *$dist_{C^{1+\beta/2}}(\psi^{-1}_{x/y} \circ \psi_{y/x}, Id) < \epsilon\eta^2\zeta^2$ (recall the notations of 0.6, section 4) where the $C^{1+\beta/2}$ distance is calculated on $R_{e^{-\epsilon}r(M)}(0)$ and $r(M)$ is defined in §1.1.3.*

Proof. Suppose ψ^η_x and ψ^ζ_y ϵ-overlap, and fix some $D \in \mathcal{D}$ which contains x, y such that $d(x, y) + \|\Theta_D \circ C_\chi(x) - \Theta_D \circ C_\chi(y)\| < \eta^4\zeta^4$. Write $C_{x/y} = \Theta_D \circ C_\chi(x/y)$, then $\psi_{x/y} = \exp_{x/y} \circ \nu_{x/y} \circ C_{x/y}$. By the defintion of Pesin charts: $\eta/\zeta \leq Q_\epsilon(x/y) \leq \epsilon^{\frac{90}{\beta}}\|C^{-1}_\chi(x/y)\|^{\frac{-48}{\beta}}$. In particular

$$\eta, \zeta < \epsilon^{3/\beta}$$

Our first constraint on ϵ is that it would be less than 1, and so small that

$$\epsilon^{3/\beta} < \epsilon < \frac{\min\{1, r(M), \rho(M)\}}{5(L_1 + L_2 + L_3 + L_4)^3}$$

where $r(M), \rho(M)$ are defined on §1.1.3, and

(1) L_1 is a uniform Lipschitz constant for the maps $(x, v) \mapsto (\exp_x \circ \nu_x)(v)$ on $D \times B_{r(M)}(0)$ $(D \in \mathcal{D})$
(2) L_2 is a uniform Lipschitz constant for the maps $x \mapsto \nu_x^{-1} \exp_x^{-1}$ from D into $C^2(D, \mathbb{R}^2)$ $(D \in \mathcal{D})$
(3) L_3 is a uniform Lipschitz constant for $\exp_x^{-1} : B_{\rho(M)}(x) \to T_x M$ $(x \in M)$
(4) L_4 is a uniform Lipschitz constant for $\exp_x : B_{r(M)}(0) \to M$ $(x \in M)$

We assume WLOG that these constants are all larger than one.

The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of [Sar13], proposition 3.2, with only a few changes in the constants to accommodate the general dimension d.

$$d(\exp_y \circ \nu_y[C_x v], \exp_x \circ \nu_x[C_x v]) < L_1 \eta^4 \zeta^4$$

□

Remark: By 2. the greater the distortion of ψ_x or ψ_y the closer they are one to another. This distortion compensating bound will be used in the sequel to argue that $\psi_{f(x)}^{-1} \circ f \circ \psi_x$ remains close to a linear hyperbolic map if we replace $\psi_{f(x)}$ by an overlapping map ψ_y (prop. 1.2.4 below).

Lemma 1.2.3. *Suppose $\psi_{x_1}^{\eta_1}, \psi_{x_2}^{\eta_2}$ $\epsilon-$overlap, then*

(1)

$$d_{C^1}(\psi_{x_2}^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_1}, Id), \|C_1^{-1} - C_2^{-1}\| < 2\epsilon Q_\epsilon(x_1) Q_\epsilon(x_2)$$

(2)

$$\frac{\|C_1^{-1}\|}{\|C_2^{-1}\|} = e^{\pm Q_\epsilon(x_1) Q_\epsilon(x_2)}$$

This lemma is conceptually similar to lemma 1.2.3 in [Sar13], with a similar proof. We make a few changes in the formulation to fit our own technical needs, as we discard the use of the terms "distortion bounds" as it is being done in Sarig's work.

Proof. Following the notations of the last proposition, we denote $C_{x/y}$ with $C_{1/2}$ ("/" is used here as in the notations of §0.6, section 4):

$\psi_{x_2}^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_1}$ maps $R_{e^{-\epsilon}\eta_1}(0)$ into $\mathbb{R}^d$. Its derivative at the origin is :

$$\begin{aligned} A :=& C_\chi^{-1}(x_2) d_{x_1} \exp_{x_2}^{-1} C_\chi(x_1) = C_2^{-1} d_{x_1}[\nu_{x_2}^{-1} \exp_{x_2}^{-1}] \nu_{x_1} C_1 \\ =& C_2^{-1} C_1 + C_2^{-1}(d_{x_1}[\nu_{x_2}^{-1} \exp_{x_2}^{-1}] - \nu_{x_1}^{-1}) \nu_{x_1} C_1 \\ \equiv& C_2^{-1} C_1 + C_2^{-1}(d_{x_1}[\nu_{x_2}^{-1} \exp_{x_2}^{-1}] - d_{x_1}[\nu_{x_1}^{-1} \exp_{x_1}^{-1}]) \nu_{x_1} C_1 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|d_{x_1}[\nu_{x_2}^{-1} \exp_{x_2}^{-1}] - d_{x_1}[\nu_{x_1}^{-1} \exp_{x_1}^{-1}]\| \le L_2 d(x_1, x_2) < L_2 \eta_1^4 \eta_2^4 < \epsilon \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2$, and $\nu_{x_1} C_1$ is a contraction, and $\|A - Id\| \le d_{C^1}(\psi_{x_2}^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_1}, Id) < \epsilon \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2$:

$$\|C_2^{-1} C_1 - Id\| < 2\epsilon \|C_2^{-1}\| \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2$$

We have that $\|C_1^{-1} - C_2^{-1}\| \le \|C_1^{-1}\| \cdot \|C_2^{-1} C_1 - Id\| \le 2\epsilon \|C_1^{-1}\| \cdot \|C_2^{-1}\| \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 < 2\epsilon \eta_1 \eta_2 \le 2\epsilon Q_\epsilon(x_1) Q_\epsilon(x_2)$. This concludes part 1.

For part 2:

$$\frac{\|C_1^{-1}\|}{\|C_2^{-1}\|} \le 1 + \frac{Q_\epsilon(x_1) Q_\epsilon(x_2)}{\|C_2^{-1}\|} \le e^{Q_\epsilon(x_1) Q_\epsilon(x_2)}$$

And by symmetry $\frac{\|C_1^{-1}\|}{\|C_2^{-1}\|} = e^{\pm Q_\epsilon(x_1) Q_\epsilon(x_2)}$ □

1.2.2. *The form of f in overlapping charts.* We introduce a notation: for two vectors $u \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$, $(-u-,-v-) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1+d_2}$ means the new vector whose coordinates are the coordinates of these two, put in the same order as written.

Proposition 1.2.4. *The following holds for all ϵ small enough. Suppose $x, y \in NUH^*_\chi$ and $\psi^\eta_{f(x)}$ $\epsilon-$overlaps $\psi^{\eta'}_y$, then $f_{xy} := \psi_y^{-1} \circ f \circ \psi_x$ is a well defined injective map from $R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$, and f_{xy} can be put in the form*

$$f_{xy}(-v_s-,-v_u-) = (D_s v_s + h_s(v_s,v_u), D_u v_u + h_u(v_s,v_u))$$

for $v_{s/u}$ being the "stable"/"unstable" components of the input vector u for ψ_x, where $\kappa^{-1} \le \|D_s^{-1}\|^{-1}, \|D_s\| \le e^{-\chi}$ and $e^\chi \le \|D_u^{-1}\|^{-1}, \|D_u\| \le \kappa$, $|h_{s/u}(0)| < \epsilon\eta$, $\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}|_0\| < \epsilon\eta^{\beta/3}$, and $\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}|_{v_1} - \frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}|_{v_2}\| \le \epsilon|v_1-v_2|^{\beta/3}$ on $R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$. A similar statement holds for f_{xy}^{-1}, assuming that $\psi^{\eta'}_{f^{-1}(y)}$ $\epsilon-$overlaps ψ^η_x.

Proof. (Compare with [Sar13], prop. 3.4) We write $f_{xy} = (\psi_y^{-1} \circ \psi_{f(x)}) \circ f_x$, and treat f_{xy} as a perturbation of f_x. Recall theorem 1.1.13.: for small enough ϵ, f_x has the following properties:

- It is well-defined, differentiable, and injective on $R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$.
- $f_x(0) = 0, d_0 f_x = D_\chi(x)$
- For all $v_1, v_2 \in R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$: $\|d_{v_1} f_x - d_{v_2} f_x\| \le 2\epsilon|v_1 - v_2|^{\beta/2}$
  (Because the $C^{1+\beta/2}$ distance between f_x and $d_0 f_x$ on $R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$ is less than ϵ)
- For every $0 < \eta < Q_\epsilon(x)$ and $v \in R_\eta(0)$: $\|d_v f_x\| < 3\kappa$, provided ϵ is small enough (because $\|d_v f_x\| \le \|d_0 f_x\| + \epsilon\eta^{\beta/2} < 2\kappa + \epsilon$)

The second and fourth points imply that $f_x[R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)] \subset B_{3\kappa Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$. Now since $Q_\epsilon(x) < \epsilon^{3/\beta}$: $f_x[R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)] \subset B_{3\kappa\epsilon^{3/\beta}}(0)$. If ϵ is so small that $3\kappa\epsilon^{3/\beta} < e^{-\epsilon}r$, then $f_x[R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)] \subset B_{e^{-\epsilon}r}(0) \subset R_{e^{-\epsilon}r}(0)$, which is the domain of $\psi_y^{-1} \circ \psi_{f(x)}$ according to proposition 1.2.2. Therefore f_{xy} is well-defined, differentiable and injective on $R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$.

h_s is defined by taking the first S coordinates of $f_{xy}(v_s, v_u)$, and subtracting $D_s v_s$: basically the equation in the statement defines h_s, h_u. It is left to check the properties:

$$(-h_s(0)-,-h_u(0)-) = f_{xy}(0) = \psi_y^{-1}(f(x)) = (\psi_y^{-1} \circ \psi_{f(x)})(0) \text{ therefore}$$
$$|(-h_s(0)-,-h_u(0)-)| \le d_{C^0}(\psi_y^{-1} \circ \psi_{f(x)}, Id) < (\because \text{prop. } 1.2.2) < \epsilon\eta^2(\eta')^2 < \epsilon\eta$$

Now, by rearranging the derivative of $(\psi_y^{-1} \circ \psi_{f(x)}) \circ f_x$:

$$d_v f_{xy} = [d_{f_x(v)}(\psi_y^{-1} \circ \psi_{f(x)}) - Id] d_v f_x + [d_v f_x - d_0 f_x] + d_0 f_x$$

The norm of the first summand is bounded by $3\kappa\epsilon\eta$. The norm of the second summand is less than $\epsilon|v|^{\beta/2} < \sqrt{d}\epsilon\eta^{\beta/2}$. The third term is $D_\chi(x) = d_0 f_x$. Thus

$$\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}\| = \|d_v f_{xy} - D_\chi(x)\| < \epsilon\eta^{\beta/2}[3\kappa + \sqrt{d}] = \epsilon\eta^{\beta/3}[3\kappa + \sqrt{d}]\eta^{\beta/6} < \epsilon\eta^{\beta/3}[3\kappa + \sqrt{d}]\sqrt{\epsilon}$$

If ϵ is so small that $[3\kappa + \sqrt{d}]\sqrt{\epsilon} < 1$, where, then $\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}\| < \epsilon\eta^{\beta/3}$ on $R_\eta(0)$. In particular: $\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}|_0\| < \epsilon\eta^{\beta/3}$. From the expression for $d_v f_{xy}$ we get that for every $v_1, v_2 \in R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$:

$$\|d_{v_1} f_{xy} - d_{v_2} f_{xy}\| \le \|d_{f_x(v_1)}(\psi_y^{-1} \circ \psi_{f(x)}) - d_{f_x(v_2)}(\psi_y^{-1} \circ \psi_{f(x)})\| \cdot \|d_{v_1} f_x\| + \|d_{v_1} f_x - d_{v_2} f_x\| \cdot (\|d_{f_x(v_1)}(\psi_y^{-1} \circ \psi_{f(x)})\| + 1)$$

Using that $d_{C^{1+\beta/2}}(\psi_y^{-1} \circ \psi_{f(x)}, Id) < \epsilon\eta$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\|d_{v_1} f_{xy} - d_{v_2} f_{xy}\| \le& \epsilon\eta |f_x(v_1) - f_x(v_2)|^{\beta/2} \cdot 3\kappa + 2\epsilon|u-v|^{\beta/2}(\epsilon\eta + 2) \\ \le& \epsilon\eta \sup_{w \in R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)} \|d_w f_x\|^{\beta/2} \cdot \|v_1 - v_2\|^{\beta/2} \cdot 3\kappa + 5\epsilon|v_1 - v_2|^{\beta/2} \\ \le& \epsilon((3\kappa)^{1+\beta/2}\eta + 5)|v_1 - v_2|^{\beta/2} \le 6\epsilon|v_1 - v_2|^{\beta/2}, \text{ provided } \epsilon \text{ is small enough.}\end{aligned}$$

Recalling $Q_\epsilon(x) < \epsilon^{3/\beta}$, $v_1, v_2 \in R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$, and plugging in:

$$\|d_{v_1} f_{xy} - d_{v_2} f_{xy}\| \le 6\epsilon(3Q_\epsilon(x))^{\beta/6}|v_1 - v_2|^{\beta/3} < 12\epsilon^{3/2}|v_1 - v_2|^{\beta/3} < \frac{1}{3}\epsilon|v_1 - v_2|^{\beta/3} \text{(provided } \epsilon \text{ is small enough).}$$

□

1.2.3. *Coarse graining.* Recall the definition of $s(x)$ for a Lyapunov regular $x \in NUH\chi$, in definition 1.1.1, and the assumption $s(x) \in \{1, ..., d-1\}$.

Proposition 1.2.5. *The following holds for all ϵ small enough: There exists a countable collection $\mathcal{A}$ of pesin charts with the following properties:*

(1) Discreteness: $\{\psi_x^\eta \in \mathcal{A} : \eta > t\}$ is finite for every $t > 0$

(2) Sufficiency: For every $x \in NUH_\chi^*$ and for every sequence of positive numbers $0 < \eta_n \leq e^{-\epsilon/3} Q_\epsilon(f^n(x))$ in I_ϵ s.t. $e^{-\epsilon} \leq \frac{\eta_n}{\eta_{n+1}} \leq e^\epsilon$ there exists a sequence $\{\psi_{x_n}^{\eta_n}\}_{n\mathbb{Z}}$ of elements of $\mathcal{A}$ s.t. for every n:

(a) $\psi_{x_n}^{\eta_n}$ ϵ-overlaps $\psi_{f^n(x)}^{\eta_n}$, $\frac{Q_\epsilon(f^n(x))}{Q_\epsilon(x_n)} = e^{\pm\epsilon}$ and $s(x_n) = s(f^n(x))$ $(= s(x)$, since Lyapunov exponents and dimensions are f-inv.)

(b) $\psi_{f(x_n)}^{\eta_{n+1}}$ ϵ-overlaps $\psi_{x_{n+1}}^{\eta_{n+1}}$

(c) $\psi_{f^{-1}(x_n)}^{\eta_{n-1}}$ ϵ-overlaps $\psi_{x_{n-1}}^{\eta_{n-1}}$

(d) $\psi_{x_n}^{\eta'_n} \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $\eta'_n \in I_\epsilon$ s.t. $\eta_n \leq \eta'_n \leq \min\{Q_\epsilon(x_n), e^\epsilon \eta_n\}$

Proof. See [Sar13], prop. 3.5. Adjust to the fact that in the general dimensional case, the dimension of the stable Lyapunov subspace can vary from point to point. We address this in the discretization we do, and in the properties our definitions, and thus our constructions, posses. We define $X := M^3 \times (0,\infty)^3 \times GL_d(\mathbb{R})^3 \times \{1, ..., d-1\}$, instead of Sarig's $X := M^3 \times (0,\infty)^3 \times GL_d(\mathbb{R})^3$. A chart can be parametrized by a point $x \in M$, a linear map $C_\chi(x)$, and a real number η. A chain of charts also posses the same stable dimension $s(x)$ for each term. The proper discretization of the space X is thus the key for the coarse graining and this proposition.

□

1.3. ϵ-chains and infinite-to-one Markov extension of f.

1.3.1. *Double charts and ϵ-chains.* Recall that ψ_x^η $(0 < \eta \leq Q_\epsilon(x))$ stands for the Pesin chart $\psi_x : R_\eta(0) \to M$. An *ϵ-double Pesin chart* (or just "double chart") is a pair $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} := (\psi_x^{p^s}, \psi_x^{p^u})$ where $0 < p^u, p^s \leq Q_\epsilon(x)$.

Definition 1.3.1. *$\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$ means*

- *$\psi_x^{p^s \wedge p^u}$ and $\psi_{f^{-1}(y)}^{p^s \wedge p^u}$ ϵ-overlap*
- *$\psi_{f(x)}^{q^s \wedge q^u}$ and $\psi_y^{q^s \wedge q^u}$ ϵ-overlap*
- *$q^u = \min\{e^\epsilon p^u, Q_\epsilon(y)\}$ and $p^s = \min\{e^\epsilon q^s, Q_\epsilon(x)\}$*
- *$s(x) = s(y)$*

  (this requirement did not appear in Sarig's definition, as it is trivial in the two dimensional hyperbolic case)

Definition 1.3.2. *(see* [Sar13]*, defintion 4.2) $\{\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u}\}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ (resp. $\{\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u}\}_{i\geq 0}$ and $\{\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u}\}_{i\leq 0}$) is called an ϵ-chain (resp. positive , negative ϵ-chain) if $\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u} \to \psi_{x_{i+1}}^{p_{i+1}^s,p_{i+1}^u}$ for all i. We abuse terminology and drop the ϵ in "ϵ-chains".*

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the countable set of Pesin charts we have constructed in §1.2.3 and recall that $I_\epsilon = \{e^{-k\epsilon/3} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$

Definition 1.3.3. *$\mathcal{G}$ is the directed graph with vertices $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ where*

- $\mathcal{V} := \{\psi_x^{p^u,p^s} : \psi_x^{p^u \wedge p^s} \in \mathcal{A}, p^s, p^u \in I_\epsilon, p^s, p^u \leq Q_\epsilon(x)\}$
- $\mathcal{E} := \{(\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}, \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} : \psi_x^{p^s,p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}\}$

This is a countable directed graph. Every vertex has a finite degree, because of the following lemma and prop. 1.2.5 .

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{G}) := \{x \in \mathcal{V}^{\mathbb{Z}} : (x_i, x_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{E}, \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

$\Sigma(\mathcal{G})$ is the Markov-shift associated with the directed graph $\mathcal{G}$. It comes equipped with the left-shift σ, and the standard metric.

Lemma 1.3.4. *If $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$ then $\frac{q^u \wedge q^s}{p^u \wedge p^s} = e^{\pm\epsilon}$. Therefore for every $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} \in \mathcal{V}$ there are only finitely many $\psi_y^{q^s,q^u} \in \mathcal{V}$ s.t. $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$ or $\psi_y^{q^s,q^u} \to \psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$.*

Proof. See lemma 4.4 in [Sar13]. □

Definition 1.3.5. *Let $(Q_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence in $I_\epsilon = \{e^{-l\epsilon}\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$. A sequence of pairs $\{(p_k^s, p_k^u)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is called ϵ-subordinated to $(Q_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ if for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$:*

- $0 < p_k^s, p_k^u \le Q_k$
- $p_k^s, p_k^u \in I_\epsilon$
- $p_{k+1}^u = \min\{e^\epsilon p_k^u, Q_{k+1}\}$ *and* $p_{k-1}^s = \min\{e^\epsilon p_k^s, Q_{k-1}\}$

For example, if $\{\psi_{x_k}^{p_k^s,p_k^u}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a chain, then $\{(p_k^s, p_k^u)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is ϵ-subordinated to $\{Q_\epsilon(x_k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$.

Lemma 1.3.6. *Let $(Q_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence in I_ϵ, and suppose $q_k \in I_\epsilon$ satisfy $0 < q_k \le Q_k$ and $\frac{q_k}{q_{k+1}} = e^{\pm\epsilon}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a sequence $\{(p_k^s, p_k^u)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ which is ϵ-subordinated to $(Q_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and $p_k^s \wedge p_k^u \ge q_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. See lemma 4.6 in [Sar13]. □

Lemma 1.3.7. *Suppose $\{(p_k^s, p_k^u)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is ϵ-subordinated to a sequence $(Q_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \subset I_\epsilon$. If $\limsup_{n\to\infty}(p_n^s \wedge p_n^u) > 0$ and $\limsup_{n\to-\infty}(p_n^s \wedge p_n^u) > 0$, then p_n^u (resp. p_n^s) is equal to Q_n for infinitely many $n > 0$, and for infinitely many $n < 0$.*

Proof. See lemma 4.7 in [Sar13]. □

Proposition 1.3.8. *For every $x \in NUH_\chi^\#$ there is a chain $\{\psi_{x_k}^{p_k^s,p_k^u}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \subset \Sigma(\mathcal{G})$ s.t. $\psi_{x_k}^{p_k^s \wedge p_k^u}$ ϵ-overlaps $\psi_{f^k(x)}^{p_k^s \wedge p_k^u}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. See proposition 4.5 in [Sar13], and adjust for the possibility of different dimensions of stable Lyapunov subspaces, for different regular points (which may occur in the general dimensional case). The adjustment can be done by noticing that for our case, as in Sarig's case and proof, the overlap condition is monotone. □

1.3.2. *Admissible manifolds and The Graph Transform.*

Definition 1.3.9. *(Compare with* [KM95, Sar13]*) Let $x \in NUH_\chi$, a $u-$manifold in ψ_x is a manifold $V^u \subset M$ of the form*

$$V^u = \psi_x[\{(F_1^u(t_{s(x)+1}, ..., t_d), ..., F_{s(x)}^u(t_{s(x)+1}, ..., t_d), t_{s(x)+1}, ...t_d) : |t_i| \le q\}],$$

where $0 < q \le Q_\epsilon(x)$, and $\overrightarrow{F}^u$ is a $C^{1+\beta/3}$ function s.t. $\max_{R_q(0)} |\overrightarrow{F}^u|_\infty \le Q_\epsilon(x)$.

Similarly we define an $s-$ manifold in ψ_x:

$$V^s = \psi_x[\{(t_1, ..., t_{s(x)}, F_{s(x)+1}^s(t_1, ..., t_{s(x)}), ..., F_d^s(t_1, ..., t_{s(x)})) : |t_i| \le q\}],$$

with the same requirements for $\overrightarrow{F}^s$ and q. We will use the superscript "u/s" in statements which apply to both the s case and the u case. The function $\overrightarrow{F} = \overrightarrow{F}^{u/s}$ is called the representing function of $V^{u/s}$ at ψ_x. The parameters of a u/s manifold in ψ_x are (in this context for a matrix A: $\|A\| := \sup_{v\neq 0} \frac{|Av|_\infty}{|v|_\infty}$):

- *$\sigma-$parameter: $\sigma(V^{u/s}) := \|d.\overrightarrow{F}\|_{\beta/3} := \max_{R_q(0)} \|d.\overrightarrow{F}\| + H\ddot{o}l_{\beta/3}(d.\overrightarrow{F})$, where*

  $$H\ddot{o}l_{\beta/3}(d.\overrightarrow{F}) := \max_{R_q(0)}\{\frac{\|d_{\overrightarrow{t_1}}\overrightarrow{F} - d_{\overrightarrow{t_2}}\overrightarrow{F}\|}{|\overrightarrow{t_1} - \overrightarrow{t_2}|^{\beta/3}}\}$$

- *$\gamma-$parameter: $\gamma(V^{u,s}) := \|d_0\overrightarrow{F}\|$*
- *$\varphi-$parameter: $\varphi(V^{u,s}) := |\overrightarrow{F}(0)|_\infty$*
- *$q-$parameter: $q(V^{u,s}) := q$*

*A $(u/s, \sigma, \gamma, \varphi, q)-$*manifold *in ψ_x is a u/s manifold $V^{u/s}$ in ψ_x whose parameters satisfy $\sigma(V^{u/s}) \le \sigma, \gamma(V^{u/s}) \le \gamma, \varphi(V^{u/s}) \le \varphi, q(V^{u/s}) \le q$*

Remark: Notice that the dimensions of an s or a u manifold in ψ_x depend on x, and that they sum up to d.

Definition 1.3.10. *Suppose $\psi_x^{p^u,p^s}$ is a double chart. A u/s-admissible manifold in $\psi_x^{p^u,p^s}$ is a $(u/s,\sigma,\gamma,\varphi,q)-$*manifold *in ψ_x s.t.*

$$\sigma \leq \frac{1}{2}, \gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}(p^u \wedge p^s)^{\beta/3}, \varphi \leq 10^{-3}(p^u \wedge p^s), \text{ and } q = \begin{cases} p^u & u-\text{manifolds} \\ p^s & s-\text{manifolds.} \end{cases}$$

Remark: If $\epsilon < 1$ (as we always assume), then these conditions together with $p^u, p^s < Q_\epsilon(x)$ force

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\overrightarrow{F}) = \max_{R_q(0)} \frac{|\overrightarrow{F}(\overrightarrow{t_1}) - \overrightarrow{F}(\overrightarrow{t_2})|_\infty}{|\overrightarrow{t}_1 - \overrightarrow{t}_2|_\infty} < \epsilon,$$

because for every $\overrightarrow{t}_{u/s}$ in the domain of $\overrightarrow{F}$, $|\overrightarrow{t}_{u/s}|_\infty \leq p^{u/s} \leq Q_\epsilon(x) < \epsilon^{3/\beta}$ and $\|d_{\overrightarrow{t}_{u/s}} F\| \leq \|d_0 F\| + \mathrm{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d.\overrightarrow{F}) \cdot |\overrightarrow{t}_{u/s}|_\infty^{\beta/3} \leq \frac{1}{2}(p^u \wedge p^s)^{\beta/3} + \frac{1}{2}(p^{u/s})^{\beta/3} < (p^{u/s})^{\beta/3} < \epsilon$ and by Lagrange's mean-value theorem applied to the restriction of $\vec{F}$ to the interval connecting each $\vec{t_1}$ and $\vec{t_2}$, we are done. Another important remark: If ϵ is small enough then $\max_{R_q(0)} |\overrightarrow{F}|_\infty < 10^{-2} Q_\epsilon(x)$, since $\max_{R_q(0)} |\overrightarrow{F}|_\infty \leq |\overrightarrow{F}(0)|_\infty + \mathrm{Lip}(\overrightarrow{F}) \cdot p^{u/s} < \varphi + \epsilon p^{u/s} \leq (10^{-3} + \epsilon) p^{u/s} < 10^{-2} p^{u/s}$

Definition 1.3.11.

(1) *Let V_1, V_2 be two $u-$ manifolds (resp. $s-$manifolds) in ψ_x s.t. $q(V_1) = q(V_2)$, then:*

$$dist(V_1, V_2) := \max |F_1 - F_2|_\infty, dist_{C^1}(V_1, V_2) := \max |F_1 - F_2|_\infty + \max \|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|$$

(2) *For a map $E : \mathrm{Dom} \to M_{r_1}(\mathbb{R})$, where* Dom *is the closure of some open and bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^{r_2}$ and $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, the α-*norm *of $E(\cdot)$ is*

$$\|E(\cdot)\|_\alpha := \|E(\cdot)\|_\infty + Höl_\alpha(E(\cdot)), \text{ where, recall,}$$

$$\|E(\cdot)\|_\infty = \sup_{s \in \mathrm{Dom}} \|E(s)\| = \sup_{s \in \mathrm{Dom}} \sup_{v \neq 0} \frac{|E(s)v|_\infty}{|v|_\infty}, \text{ and } Höl_\alpha(E(\cdot)) = \sup_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathrm{Dom}} \{\frac{\|E(s_1) - E(s_2)\|}{|s_1 - s_2|_\infty^\alpha}\}.$$

Remark:

(1) The second section of this definition is a generalization of the specific $\frac{\beta}{3}$-norm of admissible manifolds, as represented by the σ parameter in definition 1.3.9.

(2) Notice that the difference between $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ in our notations, is that $\|\cdot\|$ is taken over an operator, while $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is taken over a map that returns operators, and returns the supremum of norms over its whole domain.

Lemma 1.3.12. *Let $E : \mathrm{dom}(E) \to M_r(\mathbb{R})$ be a map as in definition 1.3.11. Then for any $0 < \alpha < 1$, if $\|E(\cdot)\|_\alpha < 1$, then*

$$\|(Id + E(\cdot))^{-1}\|_\alpha \leq \frac{1}{1 - \|E(\cdot)\|_\alpha}$$

Proof. We claim that for any two φ and ψ satisfying the same assumptions as E, $\|\psi \cdot \varphi\|_\alpha \leq \|\varphi\|_\alpha \cdot \|\psi\|_\alpha$. Check that in order to see that, it's enough to show that $\mathrm{Höl}_\alpha(\varphi \cdot \psi) \leq \mathrm{Höl}_\alpha(\psi) \cdot \|\varphi\|_\infty + \mathrm{Höl}_\alpha(\varphi) \cdot \|\psi\|_\infty$. Indeed,

$$\sup_{x,y \in \mathrm{Dom}} \frac{|\varphi(x)\psi(x) - \varphi(y)\psi(y)|}{|x-y|^\alpha} = \sup_{x,y \in \mathrm{Dom}} \frac{|\varphi(x)\psi(x) - \varphi(x)\psi(y) + \varphi(x)\psi(y) - \varphi(y)\psi(y)|}{|x-y|^\alpha} \leq \mathrm{RHS}.$$

It is also easy to check that $BH := \{\varphi : dom(E) \to M_r(\mathbb{R}) : \|\varphi\|_\alpha < \infty\}$ is a complete Banach space, and hence a Banach algebra. By a well known lemma in Banach algebras, $\|(Id + E(\cdot))^{-1}\|_\alpha \leq \frac{1}{1 - \|E(\cdot)\|_\alpha}$, and we are done.

□

Proposition 1.3.13. *The following holds for all ϵ small enough. Let V^u be a $u-$admissible manifold in $\psi_x^{p^u,p^s}$, and V^s an $s-$admissible manifold in $\psi_x^{p^u,p^s}$, then:*

(1) V^u and V^s intersect at a unique point P
(2) $P = \psi_x(\overrightarrow{t})$ with $|\overrightarrow{t}|_\infty \le 10^{-2}(p^s \wedge p^u)$
(3) P is a Lipschitz function of (V^s, V^u), with Lipschitz constant less than 3

Proof. Assume $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Remark: We will omit the $\overrightarrow{\cdot}$ notation when it is clear that the object under inspection is a vector. Write $V^u = \psi_x[\{(-F(t_u)-, -t_u-) : |t_u|_\infty \le p^u\}]$ and $V^s = \psi_x[\{(-t_s-, -G(t_s)-) : |t_s|_\infty \le p^s\}]$.

Let $\eta := p^s \wedge p^u$. Note that $\eta < \epsilon$ and that $|F(0)|_\infty, |G(0)|_\infty \le 10^{-3}\eta$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(F), \mathrm{Lip}(G) < \epsilon$ by a remark following definition 1.3.10. Hence the maps F and G are contractions, and they map the closed cube $\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}$ (in the respective dimensions) into itself, because for every $(H,t) \in \{(F,t_u),(G,t_s)\}$:

$$|H(t)|_\infty \le |H(0)|_\infty + \mathrm{Lip}(H)|t|_\infty < 10^{-3}\eta + \epsilon 10^{-2}\eta = (10^{-1}+\epsilon)10^{-2}\eta < 10^{-2}\eta$$

It follows that $G \circ F$ is a ϵ^2 contraction of $\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}$ into itself. By the Banach fixed point theorem it has a unique fixed point: $G \circ F(w) = w$. Denote $v = F(w)$. We claim V^s, V^u intersect at

$$P = \psi_x(-F(w)-, -w-) = \psi_x(-v-, -w-) = \psi_x(-v-, -G(v)-)$$

- $P \in V^u$ since $v = F(w)$ and $|w|_\infty \le 10^{-2}\eta < p^u$.
- $P \in V^s$ since $w = G \circ F(w) = G(v)$ and $|v|_\infty < |F(0)|_\infty + \mathrm{Lip}(F)|w|_\infty \le 10^{-3}\eta + \epsilon 10^{-2}\eta < 10^{-2}\eta < p^s$.

We also see that $|v|_\infty, |w|_\infty \le 10^{-2}\eta$.

We claim that P is the unique intersection point of V^s, V^u. Denote $\xi = p^u \vee p^s$ and extend F, G arbitrarily to $\epsilon-$Lipschitz functions $\tilde{F}, \tilde{G} : \overline{R_\xi(0)} \to \overline{R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)}$ [HU80]. This can be done using McShanen's extension formula $\tilde{f}(x) = \sup_{u \in dom(f)} \{f(u) - \mathrm{Lip}(f) \cdot |x-u|\}$, [McS34]. Let $\tilde{V^s}, \tilde{V^u}$ denote the $u/s-$sets represented by $\tilde{F}, \tilde{G}$. Any intersection point of V^s, V^u is an intersection point of $\tilde{F}, \tilde{G}$, which takes the form $\tilde{P} = \psi_x(-\tilde{v}-, -\tilde{w}-)$ where $\tilde{v} = \tilde{F}(\tilde{w})$ and $\tilde{w} = \tilde{G}(\tilde{v})$. Notice that $\tilde{w}$ is a fixed point of $\tilde{G} \circ \tilde{F}$. The same calculations as before show that $\tilde{G} \circ \tilde{F}$ contracts $\overline{R_\xi(0)}$ into itself. Such a map has a unique fixed point—hence $\tilde{w} = w$, whence $\tilde{P} = P$. This concludes parts 1,2.

Next we will show that P is a Lipschitz function of (V^s, V^u). Suppose V_i^u, V_i^s $(i = 1, 2)$ are represented by F_i and G_i respectively. Let P_i denote the intersection points of $V_i^s \cap V_i^u$. We saw above that $P_i = \psi_x(-v_i-, -w_i-)$, where w_i is a fixed point of $f_i := G_i \circ F_i : \overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)} \to \overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}$. f_i are ϵ^2 contractions of $\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}$ into itself. Therefore:

$$|w_1 - w_2|_\infty = |f_1^n(w_1) - f_2^n(w_2)|_\infty \le |f_1(f_1^{n-1}(w_1)) - f_2(f_1^{n-1}(w_1))|_\infty + |f_2(f_1^{n-1}(w_1)) - f_2(f_2^{n-1}(w_2))|_\infty \le$$

$$\le \max_{\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}} |f_1 - f_2|_\infty + \epsilon^2 |f_1^{n-1}(w_1) - f_2^{n-1}(w_2)|_\infty \le$$

$$\le \ldots \le \max_{\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}} |f_1 - f_2|_\infty (1 + \epsilon^2 + \ldots + \epsilon^{2(n-1)}) + \epsilon^2 |w_1 - w_2|_\infty$$

and passing to the limit $n \to \infty$:

$$|w_1 - w_2|_\infty \le (1-\epsilon^2)^{-2} \max_{\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}} |f_1 - f_2|_\infty$$

Similarly v_i is a fixed point of $g_i = F_i \circ G_i$, a contraction from $\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}$ to itself. The same arguments give $|v_1 - v_2|_\infty \le (1-\epsilon^2)^{-1} \max_{\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}} |g_1 - g_2|_\infty$ And since ψ_x is 2-Lipschitz:

$$d(P_1, P_2) < \frac{2}{1-\epsilon^2} \left(\max_{\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}} |g_1 - g_2|_\infty + \max_{\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}} |f_1 - f_2|_\infty \right)$$

Now

$$\max_{\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}} |F_1 \circ G_1 - F_2 \circ G_2|_\infty \le \max_{\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}} |F_1 \circ G_1 - F_1 \circ G_2|_\infty + \max_{\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}} |F_1 \circ G_2 - F_2 \circ G_2|_\infty \le$$

$$\le \mathrm{Lip}(F_1) \max_{\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}} |G_1 - G_2|_\infty + \max_{\overline{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}} |F_1 - F_2|_\infty$$

and in the same way

$$\max_{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}|G_1\circ F_1 - G_2\circ F_2|_\infty \le \mathrm{Lip}(G_1)\max_{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}|F_1-F_2|_\infty + \max_{R_{10^{-2}\eta}(0)}|G_1-G_2|_\infty$$

So since $\mathrm{Lip}(G), \mathrm{Lip}(F) \le \epsilon$: $d(P_1,P_2) < \frac{2(1+\epsilon)}{1-\epsilon^2}[dist(V_1^s,V_2^s) + dist(V_1^u,V_2^u)]$

For small enough ϵ: $\frac{2(1+\epsilon)}{1-\epsilon^2} < 3$, and this completes part 3.

□

The next theorem analyzes the action of f on admissible manifolds. Such analysis is often referred as a collection of Graph Transform Lemmas, and is used to show Pesin's stable manifold theorem ([BP07] chapter 7, [Pes76]). The earliest version of these methods were introduced firstly by Perron in [Per29, Per30]. The analysis we make shows that the Graph Transform preserves admissibility as defined above. The general idea is similar to what Sarig does in [Sar13], §4.2 for the two dimensional case. Katok and Mendoza treat the general dimensional case in [KM95], but our case requires more strict additional analytic properties, as in Sarig's work. Our work also requires additional analysis to accommodate the vector calculus case, and some variations to claims.

Theorem 1.3.14. *(Graph Transform) The following holds for all ϵ small enough: suppose $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$, and V^u is a u-admissible manifold in $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$, then:*

(1) $f[V^u]$ contains a u-manifold $\hat{V}^u$ in $\psi_y^{q_s,q_u}$ with parameters:
- $\sigma(\hat{V}^u) \le e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}e^{-2\chi}[\sigma(V^u)+\sqrt{\epsilon}]$
- $\gamma(\hat{V}^u) \le e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}e^{-2\chi}[\gamma(V^u)+\epsilon^{\beta/3}(q^s\wedge q^u)^{\beta/3}]$
- $\varphi(\hat{V}^u) \le e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}e^{-2\chi}[\varphi+\sqrt{\epsilon}(q^s\wedge q^u)]$
- $q(\hat{V}^u) \ge \min\{e^{-\sqrt{\epsilon}}e^{\chi}q(V^u), Q_\epsilon(y)\}$

(2) $f[V^u]$ intersects any s-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$ at a unique point.

(3) $\hat{V}^u$ restricts to a u-manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$. This is the unique u-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$ inside $f[V^u]$. We call it $\mathcal{F}_u(V^u)$.

(4) Suppose V^u is represented by the function F. If $p := (F(0),0)$ then $f(p) \in \mathcal{F}_u(V^u)$.

Similar statements hold for the f^{-1}-image of an s-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$.

Proof. Let $V^u = \psi_x[\{(F_1^u(t_{s(x)+1},...,t_d),...,F_{s(x)}^u(t_{s(x)+1},...,t_d),t_{s(x)+1},...t_d) : |t_i| \le p^u\}]$ be a u-admissible manifold in $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$. We omit the ^{u} super script of F to ease notations, and denote the parameters of V^u by σ,γ,φ and q, and let $\eta := p^s \wedge p^u$. V^u is admissible, so $\sigma \le \frac{1}{2}, \gamma \le \frac{1}{2}\eta^{\beta/3}, \varphi \le 10^{-3}\eta, q = p^u$, and $\mathrm{Lip}(F) < \epsilon$. We analyze $\Gamma_y^u = \psi_y^{-1}[f[V^u]]$, where $f_{xy} = \psi_y^{-1}\circ f\circ\psi_x$ and $graph(F) := \{(-F(t)-,-t-) : |t|_\infty \le q\}$. Since V^u is admissible, $graph(F) \subset R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$. On this domain, f_{xy} can be written as follows (by prop. 1.2.4):

$$f_{xy}(v_s,v_u) = (D_sv_s + h_s(v_s,v_u), D_uv_u + h_u(v_s,v_u))$$

where $\kappa^{-1} \le \|D_s^{-1}\|^{-1}, \|D_s\| \le e^{-\chi}$ and $e^{\chi} \le \|D_u^{-1}\|^{-1}, \|D_u\| \le \kappa$, $|h_{s/u}(0)| < \epsilon\eta$, $\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}|_0\| < \epsilon\eta^{\beta/3}$, and $\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}|_{v_1} - \frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}|_{v_2}\| \le \epsilon|v_1-v_2|^{\beta/3}$ on $R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0)$. From the proof of prop. 1.2.4 we got that $\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}\| < \epsilon\eta^{\beta/3}$ on $R_\eta(0)$, so since $\eta \le Q_\epsilon(x) \le \epsilon^{3/\beta}$ we altogether get:

$$\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}\| < \epsilon^2, \tag{4}$$

and $|h_{s/u}(0)| < \epsilon^2$ on $graph(F)$. Using the equation for f_{xy} we can put Γ_y^u in the following form:

$$\Gamma_y^u = \{(D_sF(t) + h_s(F(t),t), D_ut + h_u(F(t),t) : |t|_\infty \le q\}$$

The idea (as in [KM95])im is to call the "u" part of coordinates τ, solve for $t = t(\tau)$, and to substitute the result in the "s" coordinates.

Claim 1: The following holds for all ϵ small enough: $D_ut + h_u(F(t),t) = \tau$ has a unique solution $t = t(\tau)$ for all $\tau \in R_{e^{\chi-\sqrt{\epsilon}}q}(0)$, and

(a) $\mathrm{Lip}(t) < e^{-\chi+\epsilon}$,

(b) $|t(0)|_\infty < 2\epsilon\eta$,

(c) The $\frac{\beta}{3}$-norm of $d.t$ is smaller than $e^{-\chi}e^{3\epsilon}$.

Proof: Let $\tau(t) := D_u t + h_u(F(t),t)$. For every $|t|_\infty \le q$ and a unit vector v:

$$\begin{aligned}|d_t\tau v| \ge& |D_u v| - max\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}\| \cdot (\|d_tF\| + u(x)) \ge |D_u v| - max\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}\| \cdot (\|d_tF\| + d)\\ \ge& |D_u v| - \epsilon^2(\epsilon + d) \ (\because \text{Eq. (4)})\\ \ge& |D_u v|(1-\epsilon^2(\epsilon+d))(\because |D_u v| \ge \|D_u^{-1}\|^{-1} \ge e^\chi > 1) > e^{-\epsilon}\|D_u^{-1}\|^{-1}(\text{provided } \epsilon \text{ is small enough})\end{aligned}$$

Since v was arbitrary, it follows that τ is expanding by a factor of at least $e^{-\epsilon}\|D_u^{-1}\|^{-1} \ge e^{\chi-\epsilon} > 1$, whence 1-1. Since τ is 1-1, τ^{-1} is well-defined on $\tau[\overline{R_q(0)}]$. We estimate this set: Since τ is continuous and $e^{-\epsilon}\|D_u^{-1}\|^{-1}$ expanding (recall, these calculations are done w.r.t the supremum norm, as defined in definition 1.3.9): $\tau[\overline{R_q(0)}] \supset \overline{R_{e^{-\epsilon}\|D_u^{-1}\|^{-1}q}(\tau(0))}$. The center of the box can be estimated as follows:

$$|\tau(0)|_\infty = |h_u(F(0),0)|_\infty \le |h_u(0,0)|_\infty + max\|\frac{\partial(h_s,h_u)}{\partial(v_s,v_u)}\||F(0)|_\infty \le \epsilon\eta + \epsilon^2 10^{-3}\eta \le 2\epsilon\eta$$

Recall that $\eta \le q$, and therefore $|\tau(0)|_\infty \le 2\epsilon q$, and hence $\tau[\overline{R_q(0)}] \supset \overline{R_{(e^{-\epsilon}\|D_u\|-2\epsilon)q}(0)} \supset \overline{R_{\|D_u\|(e^{-\epsilon}-2\epsilon)q}(0)} \supset \overline{R_{e^\chi e^{-\sqrt{\epsilon}}q}(0)}$ for ϵ small enough. So τ^{-1} is well-defined on this domain.

Since $t(\cdot)$ is the inverse of a $\|D_u\|e^{-\epsilon}$-expanding map, $\text{Lip}(t) \le e^\epsilon\|D_u\|^{-1} < e^{-\chi+\epsilon}$ proving (a).

We saw above that $|\tau(0)|_\infty < 2\epsilon\eta$. For all ϵ small enough, this is significantly smaller than $e^{\chi-\sqrt{\epsilon}}q$, therefore $\tau(0)$ belongs to the domain of t. It follows that:

$$|t(0)|_\infty = |t(0) - t(\tau(0))|_\infty \le \text{Lip}(t)|\tau(0)|_\infty < e^{-\chi+\epsilon}2\epsilon\eta$$

For all ϵ small enough this is less than $2\epsilon\eta$, proving (b).

Next we will calculate the $\frac{\beta}{3}$-norm of $d_s t$. We require the following notation:

$G(s) := (F(t(s)),t(s))$, and notice that $d_{G(s)}h_u$ is a $u(x) \times d$ rectangular matrix, where $u(x) := d - s(x)$. $d_{t(s)}F$ is a $u(x) \times s(x)$ rectangular matrix. $A'(s) := \boxed{\begin{matrix} d_{t(s)}F \\ \hline I_{u(x)\times u(x)} \end{matrix}}$, and $A(s) := d_{G(s)}h_u \cdot A'$; where the notation in the definition of A' means that it is the matrix created by stacking the two matrices $d_{t(s)}F$ (represented in the standard bases, as implied by the notation) and $I_{u(x)\times u(x)}$. Using this and the identity

$$s = \tau(t(s)) = D_u t(s) + h_u(F(t(s)),t(s))$$

we get:

$$d_s t = (D_u + A(s))^{-1} = (Id + D_u^{-1}A(s))^{-1}D_u^{-1}. \tag{5}$$

From lemma 1.3.12 we see that in order to bound the $\frac{\beta}{3}$-norm of $d.t$, it's enough to show that the $\frac{\beta}{3}$-norm of $D_u^{-1}A(\cdot)$ is less than 1- the lemma is applicable since $d_s t$ is, indeed a square matrix as required, as both t and s in this set up are vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{u(x)}$ (recall, $u(x) = d - s(x)$). Next we will bound the $\frac{\beta}{3}$-norm of $D_u^{-1}A$:

$$\begin{aligned}\|A(s) - A(r)\| =& \|d_{G(s)}h_u A'(s) - d_{G(r)}h_u A'(r)\|\\ =& \|d_{G(s)}h_u A'(s) - d_{G(s)}h_u A'(r) + d_{G(s)}h_u A'(r) - d_{G(r)}h_u A'(r)\|\\ \le& \|d_{G(s)}h_u[A'(s) - A'(r)]\| + \|[d_{G(s)}h_u - d_{G(r)}h_u]A'(r)\|\\ \le& \Big(\text{Lip}(t) \cdot \|d_{G(s)}h_u\| \cdot \text{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d.F) + \text{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d.h_u) \cdot \text{Lip}(G) \cdot \|d_{t(r)}F\|\Big)|s-r|_\infty^{\beta/3}\end{aligned}$$

Now we shall use the following previously shown facts:

- $\text{Lip}(F) < \epsilon$
- $\text{Lip}(t) \le e^{-\chi+\epsilon}$
- $\text{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d.h_u) \le \epsilon$
- $d_0 h_u \le \epsilon\eta^{\beta/3}$

From the identity $G(s) = (F(t(s)), t(s))$ we get that $\mathrm{Lip}(G) \leq \mathrm{Lip}(F) \cdot \mathrm{Lip}(t) + \mathrm{Lip}(t)$; and from that and the first two items above we deduce that $\mathrm{Lip}(G) \leq 1$. We also know $\|d_{t(r)}F\| \leq \mathrm{Lip}(F) \leq \epsilon^2$.

From the last two items we deduce $\|d.h_u\|_\infty \leq (\epsilon\sqrt{2}q)^{\beta/3} + \epsilon\eta^{\beta/3}$. From the admissibility of the manifold represented by F, we get $\mathrm{Höl}_{\frac{\beta}{3}}(F)$.

So it is clear that for a small enough ϵ, $\mathrm{Höl}_{\beta/3}(A(\cdot)) < 2\epsilon^2$, and hence $\mathrm{Höl}_{\beta/3}(D_u^{-1}A(\cdot)) < 2\epsilon^2$. Also, $\|D_u^{-1}A(0)\| \leq e^{-\chi}\|A(0)\| = e^{-\chi}\|d_{(F(0),t(0))}h_u A'(0)\|$, and as quoted before claim 1 from prop. 1.2.4 $\|d_{G(s)}h_u\| \leq \epsilon^2$. So together with the conclusion $\|d.F\| \leq \epsilon$ we can deduce that for small enough ϵ, $\|A'(0)\| \leq \epsilon^2(1+\epsilon) < 2\epsilon^2$, and $\|D_u^{-1}A(0)\| \leq e^{-\chi}2\epsilon^4$. Hence $\|A(s)\| \leq \|A(0)\| + \mathrm{Höl}_{\frac{\beta}{3}}(A(\cdot)) \cdot (e^{\chi}q)^{\frac{\beta}{3}} \leq 2\epsilon^4$. Hence, in total $\|A(\cdot)\|_{\frac{\beta}{3}} \leq 2\epsilon^4 + 2\epsilon^2 < 4\epsilon^2$, and so $\|D_u^{-1}A(\cdot)\|_{\beta/3} < e^{-\chi}4\epsilon^2 < 1$. Thus we can use lemma 1.3.12. Using this lemma, together with the estimation we have just got, on Eq. (5), yields

$$\|d.t\|_{\beta/3} \leq \frac{1}{1-4\epsilon^2} \cdot \|D_u^{-1}\| \leq e^{8\epsilon^2} \cdot e^{-\chi} \leq e^{3\epsilon} \cdot e^{-\chi},$$

for a small enough ϵ, since D_u is at least e^{χ}-expanding. This completes claim 1.

We now return to substituting $t = t(s)$, we find that

$$\Gamma_y^u \supset \{(H(s), s) : |s|_\infty < e^{\chi - \sqrt{\epsilon}}q\}$$

where $s \in \mathbb{R}^{u(x)}$ (as it is the right set of coordinates of $(H(s), s)$), and $H(s) := D_sF(t(s)) + h_s(F(t(s)), t(s))$. Claim 1 guarantees that H is well-defined and $C^{1+\beta/3}$ on $R_{e^{\chi-\sqrt{\epsilon}}}(0)$. We find the parameters of H:

Claim 2: For all ϵ small enough, $|H(0)|_\infty < e^{-\chi+\sqrt{\epsilon}}[\varphi + \sqrt{\epsilon}(q^u \wedge q^s)]$, and $|H(0)|_\infty < 10^{-3}(q^u \wedge q^s)$. *Proof*: claim 1 says that $|t(0)|_\infty < 2\epsilon\eta$. Since $\mathrm{Lip}(F) < \epsilon, |F(0)|_\infty < \varphi$ and $\varphi \leq 10^{-3}\eta$: $|F(t(0))|_\infty < \varphi + 2\epsilon^2\eta < \eta$ provided ϵ is small enough. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
|H(0)|_\infty \leq& \|D_s\||F(t(0))|_\infty + |h_s(F(t(0)), t(0))|_\infty \\
\leq& \|D_s\|(\varphi + 2\epsilon^2\eta) + [|h_s(0)|_\infty + \max\|d.h_s\||(F(t(0)), t(0))|_\infty] \\
\leq& \|D_s\|(\varphi + 2\epsilon^2\eta) + [\epsilon\eta + 3\epsilon^2 \max\{|F(t(0))|_\infty, |t(0)|_\infty\}] \\
\leq& \|D_s\|(\varphi + 2\epsilon^2\eta) + [\epsilon\eta + 3\epsilon^2\eta](\because |F(t(0))|_\infty < \eta, |t(0)|_\infty < 2\epsilon\eta < \eta) \\
=& \|D_s\|[\varphi + \eta(\epsilon + 5\epsilon^2)]
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\|D_s\| \leq e^{-\chi}$, $\eta \equiv p^u \wedge p^s \leq e^{\epsilon}(q^u \wedge q^s)$ and $\varphi < 10^{-3}(p^u \wedge p^s)$: $|H(0)|_\infty \leq e^{-\chi+\epsilon}[10^{-3} + 2\epsilon](q^u \wedge q^s)$ and for all ϵ sufficiently small this is less than $10^{-3}(q^u \wedge q^s)$. The claim follows.

Claim 3: For all ϵ small enough, $\|d_0H\| < e^{-\chi+\epsilon}[\gamma + \epsilon^{\beta/3}(q^u \wedge q^s)^{\beta/3}]$, and $\|d_0H\| < \frac{1}{2}(q^u \wedge q^s)^{\beta/3}$
Proof: $\|d_0H\| \leq \|d_0t\|[\|D_s\| \cdot \|d_{t(0)}F\| + \|d_{(F(t(0)),t(0))}h_s\| \cdot \max\|A'(0)\|]$ and

- $\|d_0t\| \leq \mathrm{Lip}(t) < e^{-\chi+\epsilon}$ (claim 1)
- $\|d_{t(0)}F\| < \gamma + \frac{2}{3}\epsilon^{\beta/3}\eta^{\beta/3}$, because $\mathrm{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d.F) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and therefore by claim 1(b)
  $\|d_{t(0)}F\| < \|d_0F\| + \mathrm{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d.F)|t(0)|_\infty^{\beta/3} < \gamma + \sigma(3\epsilon\eta)^{\beta/3} < \gamma + \frac{2}{3}\epsilon^{\beta/3}\eta^{\beta/3}$
- $\|d_{(F(t(0)),t(0))}\| \leq 3\epsilon\eta^{\beta/3}$, because $|F(t(0))|_\infty < \eta$ (proof of claim 2), and $|t(0)|_\infty < 2\epsilon\eta$ (claim 1), so by the Hölder regularity of $d.h_{s/u}$:
  $\|d_{(F(t(0)),t(0))}h_s\| \leq \|d_0h_s\| + \epsilon\max\{|F(t(0))|_\infty, |t(0)|_\infty\}^{\beta/3} \leq 2\epsilon\eta^{\beta/3}$
- $\|A'(0)\| \leq 1 + \epsilon < 2$

These estimates together give us that:

$$\|d_0H\| < e^{-\chi+\epsilon}\|D_s\|[\gamma + \frac{2}{3}\epsilon^{\beta/3}\eta^{\beta/3} + \|D_s\|^{-1}3\epsilon\eta^{\beta/3} \cdot 2] < e^{-2\chi+\epsilon}[\gamma + \eta^{\beta/3}(\frac{2}{3}\epsilon^{\beta/3} + 6\kappa\epsilon)] \leq$$

$$\leq e^{-2\chi+\epsilon}[\gamma + e^{\epsilon\beta/3}(q^u \wedge q^s)^{\beta/3})(\frac{2}{3}\epsilon^{\beta/3} + 6\kappa\epsilon)]$$

This implies that for all ϵ small enough $\|d_0H\| < e^{-2\chi+\epsilon}[\gamma + \epsilon^{\beta/3}(q^u \wedge q^s)^{\beta/3}]$, which is stronger than the estimate in the claim.

Since $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}(p^u \wedge p^s)^{\beta/3}$ and $(p^u \wedge p^s) \leq e^{\epsilon}(q^u \wedge q^s)$, we also get that for all ϵ small enough: $\|d_0H\| \leq \frac{1}{2}(q^u \wedge q^s)^{\beta/3}$, as required.

Claim 4: For all ϵ small enough $\|d.H\|_{\beta/3} < e^{-2\chi+\sqrt{\epsilon}}[\sigma+\sqrt{\epsilon}]$, and $\|d.H\|_{\beta/3} < \frac{1}{2}$

Proof: By claim 1 and its proof:

- $\|d.t\|_{\beta/3} \le \|D_u^{-1}\| e^{3\epsilon}$
- $\|d_{t(\cdot)}F\|_{\beta/3} \le \sigma$ and t is a contraction.
- $\|d_{(F(t),t)}h_s\|_{\beta/3} < \epsilon$

We shall use the *small fact* shown in the proof of lemma 1.3.12: For any two $\psi, \varphi : \text{Dom} \to M_{r_1}(\mathbb{R})$, where Dom is the closure of some open and bonded subset of $\mathbb{R}^{r_2}$ and $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|\varphi \cdot \psi\|_\alpha \le \|\varphi\|_\alpha \cdot \|\psi\|_\alpha$.

Recall $H(s) = D_s F(t(s)) + h_s(F(t(s)), t(s))$, hence

$$d_s H = D_s d_{(t(s))} F d_s t + A(s)$$

Using the *small fact* from above for the left summand, and our bound for $\|A(\cdot)\|_{\frac{\beta}{3}}$ we derived in claim 1 for the right summand, we get $\|d.H\|_{\beta/3} \le \|D_s\| \cdot \sigma \cdot e^{3\epsilon-\chi} + 4\epsilon^2$. This and $\|D_s\| \le e^{-\chi}$ give us:

$$\|d.H\|_{\beta/3} \le e^{-2\chi+\sqrt{\epsilon}} \cdot [\sigma + \sqrt{\epsilon}]$$

If ϵ is small enough, then since $\sigma \le \frac{1}{2}$, $\|d.H\|_{\beta/3} \le e^{-2\chi+\sqrt{\epsilon}}[\sigma+\sqrt{\epsilon}] \le \frac{1}{2}$.

Claim 5: For all ϵ small enough $\hat{V}^u := \{\psi_y((H(s), s)) : |s|_\infty \le \min\{e^{\chi-\sqrt{\epsilon}}q, Q_\epsilon(y)\}\}$ is a u-manifold in ψ_y. The parameters of $\hat{V}^u$ satisfy section 1 from the statement of the theorem, and $\hat{V}^u$ contains a u-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^u, q^s}$.

Proof: To see that $\hat{V}^u$ is a u-manifold in ψ_y we have to check that H is $C^{1+\beta/3}$ and $\|H\|_\infty \le Q_\epsilon(y)$. Claim 1 shows that H is $C^{1+\beta/3}$. To see $\|H\|_\infty \le Q_\epsilon(y)$, we first observe that for all ϵ small enough $\text{Lip}(H) < \epsilon$ because $\|d_s H\| \le \|d_0 H\| + \text{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d.H) Q_\epsilon(y)^{\beta/3} \le \epsilon + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon < \sqrt{\epsilon}$ (for small enough ϵ).

It follows that $\|H\|_\infty \le |H(0)|_\infty + \sqrt{\epsilon} Q_\epsilon(y) < (10^{-3} + \sqrt{\epsilon}) Q_\epsilon(y) < Q_\epsilon(y)$.

Next we claim that $\hat{V}^u$ contains a u-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s, q^u}$. Since $\psi_x^{p^s, p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s, q^u}$, $q^u = \min\{e^\epsilon p^u, Q_\epsilon(y)\}$. Consequently, for every ϵ small enough

$$e^{\chi-\sqrt{\epsilon}} q \equiv e^{\chi-\sqrt{\epsilon}} p^u > e^\epsilon p^u \ge q^u$$

So $\hat{V}^u$ restricts to a u-manifold with q-parameter equal to q^u. Claims 2-4 guarantee that this manifold is u-admissible in $\psi_y^{q^s, q^u}$, and that part 1 of theorem 1.3.14 holds.

Claim 6: $f[V^u]$ contains exactly one u-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s, q^u}$. This manifold contains $f(p)$ where $p = (F(0), 0)$.

Proof: The previous claim shows existence. We prove uniqueness: using the identity $\Gamma_y^u = \{(D_s F(t) + h_s(F(t), t), D_u t + h_u(F(t), t)) : |t|_\infty \le q\}$ any u-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s, q^u}$ which is contained in $f[V^u]$ is a subset of

$$\psi_y[\{(D_s F(t) + h_s(F(t), t), D_u t + h_u(F(t), t)) : |t|_\infty \le q, |D_u t + h_u(F(t), t)|_\infty \le q^u\}]$$

We just saw in the end of claim 5 that for all ϵ small enough, $q^u < e^{\chi-\sqrt{\epsilon}} q$. By claim 1 the equation $\tau = D_u t + h_u(F(t), t)$ has a unique solution $t = t(\tau) \in R_q(0)$ for all $\tau \in R_{q^u}(0)$. Our manifold must therefore equal

$$\psi_y[\{(D_s F(t(\tau)) + h_s(F(t(\tau)), t(\tau)), \tau) : |\tau|_\infty \le q^u\}]$$

This is exactly the u-admissible manifold that we have constructed above.

Let $\mathcal{F}[V^u]$ denote the unique u-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s, q^u}$ contained in $f[V^u]$. We claim that $f(p) \in \mathcal{F}[V^u]$. By the previous paragraph it is enough to show that the second set of coordinates (the u-part) of $\psi_y^{-1}[\{f(p)\}]$ has infinity norm of less than q^u. Call the u-part τ, then:

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau|_\infty =& \text{second set of coordinates of } f_{xy}(F(0), 0) = |h_u(F(0), 0)|_\infty \\ \le& |h_u(0,0)|_\infty + max\|d.h_u\| \cdot |F(0)|_\infty < \epsilon\eta + 3\epsilon^2 \cdot 10^{-3}\eta < e^{-\epsilon}\eta < (q^s \wedge q^u) \le q^u \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the claim.

Claim 7: $f[V^u]$ intersects every s-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s, q^u}$ at a unique point.

Proof: In this part we use thoroughly the fact that in our definition for $\psi_x^{p^s, p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s, q^u}$ $s(x) = s(y)$. Let W^s be an s-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s, q^u}$. We saw in the previous claim that $f[V^u]$ and W^s intersect at

least in one point. Now we wish to show that the intersection point is unique: Recall that we can put $f[V^u]$ in the form

$$f[V^u] = \psi_y[\{(D_sF(t) + h_s(F(t),t), D_ut + h_u(F(t),t)) : |t|_\infty \le q\}]$$

we saw in the proof of claim 1 that the second coordinate $\tau(t) := D_ut + h_u(F(t),t)$ is a 1-1 continuous map whose image contains $R_{q^u}(0)$. We also saw that $\|d.t^{-1}\|^{-1} > e^{-\epsilon}\|D_u^{-1}\|^{-1} \ge e^{\chi-\epsilon} > 1$. Consequently the inverse function $t : Im(\tau) \to \overline{R_q(0)}$ satisfies $\|d.t\| < 1$, and so

$$f[V^u] = \psi_y[\{(H(s), s) : s \in Im(\tau)\}], \text{ where } \mathrm{Lip}(H) \le \epsilon$$

Let $I : \overline{R_{q^u}(0)} \to \mathbb{R}^{u(x)}$ denote the function which represents W^s in ψ_y, then $\mathrm{Lip}(I) \le \epsilon$. Extend it to an ϵ-Lipschitz function on $Im(\tau)$ (again, by [HU80]). The extension represents a Lipschitz manifold $\tilde{W}^s \supset W^s$. We wish to use the same arguments as we used in proposition 1.3.13 for uniqueness of intersection point (this time of $f[V^u]$ and $\tilde{W}^s$)- it requires the following observations:

(1) $\overline{R_{q^u}(0)} \subset \overline{R_{e^{\chi-\sqrt{\epsilon}}q}(0)} \subset Im(\tau)$, as seen in the estimation of $Im(\tau)$ in the beginning of claim 1.
(2) $Im(\tau)$ is compact, as a continuous image of a compact set.
(3) $\tau(t) = D_ut + h_u(F(t),t)$, hence $\|d.\tau\| \le \kappa + \epsilon$. Hence $diam(Im(\tau)) \le q(1+\kappa)$. So for $\epsilon < \frac{1}{\kappa+1} \wedge \frac{1}{3}$, we get that for $I \circ H$ (an ϵ^2-Lipschitz function from $Im(\tau)$ to itself), its image is contained in $\overline{R_{\epsilon^2\|d.\tau\|q+|I\circ H(\tau(0))|}(0)} \subset \overline{R_q(0)} \subset Im(\tau)$ (the last inclusion is due to the bound we have seen $|\tau(0)| \le 2\epsilon\eta$)

Hence, as in the arguments of proposition 1.3.13, we can use the Banach fixed point theorem the same way (for a contracting continuous function from a compact set into itself). This gives us that in particular, $f[V^u]$ and W^s intersect in one point at most.

This concludes this claim, and thus the proof of the theorem. The case of the s-manifold follows from the symmetry between s and u-manifolds:

(1) V is a u-admissible manifold w.r.t f iff V is an s-admissible manifold w.r.t to f^{-1}, and the parameters are the same.
(2) $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$ w.r.t f iff $\psi_y^{q^s,q^u} \to \psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$ w.r.t f^{-1}

□

Definition 1.3.15. *Suppose $\psi_x^{p_s,p_u} \to \psi_y^{q_s,q_u}$. The Graph Transforms are the maps $\mathcal{F}_{s/u}$ which map a s/u-admissible manifolds $V^{s/u}$ in $\psi_y^{q_s,q_u}/\psi_x^{p_s,p_u}$ to the unique s/u-manifold in $\psi_x^{p_s,p_u}/\psi_y^{q_s,q_u}$ contained in $f^{-1}[V^{s/u}]/f[V^{s/u}]$.*

The operators $\mathcal{F}_{s/u}$ depend on the edge $\psi_x^{p_s,p_u} \to \psi_y^{q_s,q_u}$.

Proposition 1.3.16. *If ϵ is small enough then the following holds: For any s/u-admissible manifold $V_1^{s/u}, V_2^{s/u}$ in $\psi_x^{p_s,p_u}$*

$$dist(\mathcal{F}_{s/u}(V_1^{s/u}), \mathcal{F}_{s/u}(V_2^{s/u})) \le e^{-\chi/2} dist(V_1^{s/u}, V_2^{s/u})$$

$$dist_{C^1}(\mathcal{F}_{s/u}(V_1^{s/u}), \mathcal{F}_{s/u}(V_2^{s/u})) \le e^{-\chi/2}[dist_{C^1}(V_1^{s/u}, V_2^{s/u}) + dist(V_1^{s/u}, V_2^{s/u})^{\beta/3}]$$

Proof. (For the u case) Suppose $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$, and let V_i^u be two u-admissible manifolds in $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$. We take ϵ to be small enough for the arguments in the proof of theorem 1.3.14 to work. These arguments give us that if $V_i = \psi_x[\{(F_i(t),t) : |t|_\infty \le p^u\}]$, then $\mathcal{F}_u[V_i] = \psi_y[\{(H_i(\tau),\tau) : |\tau|_\infty \le q^u\}]$, where t_i and τ are of length $u(x)$ (as a right set of components) and

- $H_i(\tau) = D_sF_i(t_i(\tau)) + h_s(F_i(t_i(\tau)), t_i(\tau))$
- $t_i(\tau)$ is defined implicitly by $D_ut_i(\tau) + h_u(F_i(t_i(\tau)), t_i(\tau)) = \tau$ and $|d.t_i|_\infty < 1$;
- $\|D_s^{-1}\| \le \kappa, \|D_s\| \le e^{-\chi}, \|D_u^{-1}\| \le e^{-\chi}, \|D_u\| \le \kappa$
- $|h_{s/u}(0)|_\infty < \epsilon(p^s \wedge p^u), \mathrm{H\ddot{o}l}_{\beta/3}(d.h_{s/u}) \le \epsilon, max\|d.h_{s/u}\| < 3\epsilon^2$

In order to prove the proposition we need to estimate $\|H_1 - H_2\|_\infty, \|d.H_1 - d.H_2\|_\infty$ in terms of $\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty, \|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|_\infty$

Part 1: For all ϵ small enough $\|t_1 - t_2\|_\infty \le \epsilon\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty$

Proof: By definition, $D_ut_i(\tau) + h_u(F_i(t_i(\tau)), t_i(\tau)) = \tau$. By differentiating both sides we get

$|D_u(t_1 - t_2)|_\infty \le |h_u(F_1(t_1), t_1) - h_u(F_2(t_2), t_2)|_\infty \le \max\|d.h_u\| \cdot \max\{|F_1(t_1) - F_2(t_2)|_\infty, |t_1 - t_2|_\infty\} \le$

$\leq \max \|d.h_u\| \cdot \max\{|F_1(t_1) - F_1(t_2)|_\infty + |F_1(t_2) - F_2(t_2)|_\infty, |t_1 - t_2|_\infty\} \leq$
$\leq 3\epsilon^2 \max\{\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty + \mathrm{Lip}(F_1)|t_1 - t_2|_\infty, |t_1 - t_2|_\infty\} \leq 3\epsilon^2\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty + 3\epsilon^2(\epsilon+1)|t_1 - t_2|_\infty$
Rearranging terms and recalling $\|D_u^{-1}\| \leq e^{-\chi}$:

$$\|t_1 - t_2\|_\infty \leq \frac{3\epsilon^2\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty}{e^{\chi-\epsilon} - 3\epsilon^2(1+\epsilon)}$$

The claim follows.

Part 2: For all ϵ small enough $\|H_1 - H_2\|_\infty < e^{-\chi/2}\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty$, whence proving the first claim of the proposition.

Proof: $|H_1 - H_2|_\infty \leq \|D_s\| \cdot |F_1(t_1) - F_2(t_2)|_\infty + |h_s(F_1(t_1), t_1) - h_s(F_2(t_2), t_2)|_\infty \leq$
$\leq \|D_s\| \cdot |F_1(t_1) - F_2(t_2)|_\infty + \|d.h_s\|_\infty \max\{|F_1(t_1) - F_2(t_2)|_\infty, |t_1 - t_2|_\infty\} \leq$
$\leq \|D_s\| \cdot (|F_1(t_1) - F_2(t_1)|_\infty + |F_2(t_1) - F_2(t_2)|_\infty) +$
$+\|d.h_s\|_\infty \cdot \max\{|F_1(t_1) - F_2(t_1)|_\infty + |F_2(t_1) - F_2(t_2)|_\infty, |t_1 - t_2|_\infty\} \leq$
$\leq \|D_s\|(\mathrm{Lip}(F_1) + \mathrm{Lip}(F_2))|t_1 - t_2|_\infty + \|d.h_s\|_\infty \max\{\mathrm{Lip}(F_1) + \mathrm{Lip}(F_2)\}|t_1 - t_2|_\infty \leq$
$\leq \Big((\|D_s\| + \|d.h_s\|_\infty)(\mathrm{Lip}(F_1) + \mathrm{Lip}(F_2)) + \|d.h_s\|_\infty\Big)|t_1 - t_2|_\infty \leq$
$\leq \Big((e^{-\chi} + 3\epsilon^2)2\epsilon + 3\epsilon^2\Big)|t_1 - t_2|_\infty \leq \Big((e^{-\chi} + 3\epsilon^2)2\epsilon + 3\epsilon^2\Big)\frac{3\epsilon^2\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty}{e^{\chi-\epsilon} - 3\epsilon^2(1+\epsilon)}$($\because$ part 1)

Now when $\epsilon \to 0$ the RHS multiplier goes to 0, hence for small enough ϵ it is smaller than $e^{-\chi/2}$.

Part 3: For all ϵ small enough:

$$\|d.t_1 - d.t_2\|_\infty < \sqrt{\epsilon}(\|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|_\infty + \|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3})$$

Proof: Define as in claim 1 of theorem 1.3.14, $A_i'(s) := \boxed{\frac{d_{t_i(s)}F_i}{I_{u(x)\times u(x)}}}$ and $A_i(s) := d_{G_i(s)}h_u \cdot A_i'(s)$, where $G_i(s) = (F_i(t_i(s)), t_i(s))$.

We have seen at the beginning of the Graph Transform that
$Id = (D_u + A_i(s))d_s t_i$. By taking differences we obtain:
$(D_u + A_1(s))(d_s t_1 - d_s t_2) = (D_u + A_1(s))d_s t_1 - (D_u + A_2)d_s t_2 + (A_2 - A_1)d_s t_2 = Id - Id + (A_2 - A_1)d_s t_2 =$
$= (A_2 - A_1)d_s t_2 = (d_{G_1}h_u \cdot A_1' - d_{G_2}h_u A_2') \cdot d_s t_2$

Define $J_i(t) := \boxed{\frac{d_t F_i}{I_{u(x)\times u(x)}}}$, which is the same as $A_i'(s)$, with a parameter change ($t = t_i(s)$). So now we see that:

$$\begin{aligned}(D_u + A_1)(d_s t_1 - d_s t_2) =& (d_{G_1}h_u \cdot J_1(t_1) - d_{G_2}h_u \cdot J_2(t_2))d_s t_2 \\ =& (d_{G_1}h_u \cdot J_1(t_1) - d_{G_2}h_u \cdot J_1(t_1) + d_{G_2}h_u \cdot J_1(t_1) - d_{G_2}h_u \cdot J_2(t_2))d_s t_2 \\ =& \Big([d_{G_1}h_u \cdot J_1(t_1) - d_{G_2}h_u \cdot J_1(t_1)] + [d_{G_2}h_u \cdot J_1(t_1) - d_{G_2}h_u \cdot J_2(t_1)] \\ &+ [d_{G_2}h_u \cdot J_2(t_1) - d_{G_2}h_u \cdot J_2(t_2)]\Big)d_s t_2 := I + II + III.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|D_u^{-1}\|^{-1} \geq e^\chi$, $\|d.F_1\|_\infty < 1$ and $\|d.h_u\|_\infty < 3\epsilon^2$, we get $\|D_u + A_1\| \geq e^\chi - 3\epsilon^2$, and hence:

$$\|d.t_1 - d.t_2\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{e^\chi - 3\epsilon^2}\|I + II + III\|_\infty \leq \|I\|_\infty + \|II\|_\infty + \|III\|_\infty (\text{for } \epsilon \text{ small enough})$$

We begin analyzing: recall $\mathrm{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d.h_{s/u}) \leq \epsilon$:

- $\|d_{(F_1(t_1),t_1)}h_u - d_{(F_2(t_1),t_1)}h_u\| \leq \epsilon\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3}$
- $\|d_{(F_2(t_1),t_1)}h_u - d_{(F_2(t_2),t_1)}h_u\| \leq \epsilon\|t_1 - t_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3}$($\because \mathrm{Lip}(F_2) < 1$)
- $\|d_{(F_2(t_2),t_1)}h_u - d_{(F_2(t_2),t_2)}h_u\|_\infty < 3\epsilon\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3}$

By part 1 $\|t_1 - t_2\|_\infty \leq \epsilon\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3}$, it follows that:

$$\|d_{G_1}h_u - d_{G_2}h_u\| < 3\epsilon\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3}$$

and hence

$$\|I\|_\infty \leq 3\epsilon\|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3}$$

Using the facts that $\|d.t_{1/2}\|_\infty < 1, \|d.h_u\|_\infty < 3\epsilon^2, \mathrm{Lip}(d.F_2) < 1$ and $\mathrm{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d.F_2) < 1$ (from the definition of admissible manifolds and the proof of the Graph Transform) we get that:

$\|II\|_\infty \le 3\epsilon^2 \|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|_\infty$,

$\|III\|_\infty \le 3\epsilon^2 \|t_1 - t_2\|_\infty \le 3\epsilon^2 \|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty \le 3\epsilon^2 \|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3}$.

So for all ϵ sufficiently small $\|d.t_1 - d.t_2\|_\infty < \sqrt{\epsilon}(\|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|_\infty + \|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3})$

Part 4: $\|d.H_1 - d.H_2\|_\infty < e^{-\chi/2}(\|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|_\infty + \|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3})$

Proof: By the definition of H_i: $d_s H_i = D_s \cdot d_{t_i} F_i \cdot d_s t_i + d_{G_i} h_u \cdot J_i(t_i) \cdot d_s t_i$

Taking differences we that:

$$\|d_s H_1 - d_s H_2\| \le \|d_s t_1 - d_s t_2\| \cdot \|D_s d_{t_1} F_1 + d_{G_1} h_u\| + \|d_s t_2\| \cdot \|D_s\| \cdot (\|d_{t_1} F_1 - d_{t_1} F_2\| + \|d_{t_1} F_2 - d_{t_2} F_2\|)$$

$$+\|d_s t_2\| \cdot \|d_{G_1} h_u - d_{G_2} h_u\| \cdot \|d_{t_1} F_1\| + \|d_s t_2\| \cdot \|d_{G_2} h_u\| \cdot \|d_{t_1} F_1 - d_{t_2} F_2\| := I' + II' + III' + IV'$$

Using the same arguments as in part 3 we can show that:

$I' \le \|d.t_1 - d.t_2\|(e^{-\chi} + 6\epsilon^2) < \sqrt{\epsilon}(\|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|_\infty + \|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3})$

$II' \le e^{-\chi}(\|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|_\infty + \|t_1 - t_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3}) \le e^{-\chi}(\|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|_\infty + \|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3})$ because of part 1

$III' \le 3\epsilon \|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3}$ (same as in the estimate of I in part 3)

$IV' \le 3\epsilon^2 \|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|_\infty + 3\epsilon^2 \|F - 1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3}$

It follows that

$$\|d.H_1 - d.H_2\|_\infty < (e^{-\chi} + 10\epsilon + \sqrt{\epsilon})(\|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|_\infty + \|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3})$$

If ϵ is small enough then

$$\|d.H_1 - d.H_2\|_\infty < e^{-\chi/2}(\|d.F_1 - d.F_2\|_\infty + \|F_1 - F_2\|_\infty^{\beta/3})$$

□

1.3.3. *A Markov extension.* Recalling the definitions from the begining of §1.3:

$$\mathcal{V} = \{\psi_x^{p^s, p^u} : \psi_x^{p^s \wedge p^u} \in \mathcal{A}, p^s, p^u \in I_\epsilon, p^s, p^u \le Q_\epsilon(x)\}$$

$$\mathcal{E} = \{(\psi_x^{p^s, p^u}, \psi_y^{q^s, q^u}) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} : \psi_x^{p^s, p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s, q^u}\}$$

$\mathcal{G}$ is the directed graph with vertices $\mathcal{V}$ and edges $\mathcal{E}$

Definition 1.3.17. $\Sigma(\mathcal{G}) := \{(v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} : v_i \in \mathcal{V}, v_i \to v_{i+1} \forall i\}$, *equipped with the left-shift* σ, *and the metric* $d(\vec{v}, \vec{w}) = e^{-\min\{|i| : v_i \neq w_i\}}$

Definition 1.3.18. *Suppose* $(v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}, v_i = \psi_x^{p_i^s, p_i^u}$ *is a chain. Let* V_{-n}^u *be a u-admissible manifold in* v_{-n}. $\mathcal{F}_u^n(v_{-n})$ *is the u-admissible manifold in* v_0 *which is a result of the application of the graph transform n times along* $v_{-n}, ..., v_{-1}$ *(each application is the transform described in section 3 of theorem 1.3.14). Similarly any s-admissible manifold in* v_n *is mapped by n applications of the graph transform to an s-admissible manifold in* v_0: $\mathcal{F}_s^n(v_n)$. *These two manifolds depend on* $v_{-n}, ..., v_n$.

Definition 1.3.19. *Let* ψ_x *be some chart. Assume* V_n *is a sequence of s/u manifolds in* ψ_x. *We say that* V_n *converges uniformly to* V, *an s/u manifold in* ψ_x, *if the representing functions of* V_n *converge uniformly to the representing function of* V.

Proposition 1.3.20. *Suppose* $(v_i = \psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s, p_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ *is a chain of double charts, and choose arbitrary u-admissible manifolds* V_{-n}^u *in* v_{-n}, *and arbitrary s-admissible manifolds* V_n^s *in* v_n. *Then:*

1. *The limits* $V^u((v_i)_{i\le 0}) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n}^u), V^s((v_i)_{i\ge 0}) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{F}_s^n(V_n^s)$ *exist, and are independent of the choice of* V_{-n}^u *and* V_n^s.
2. $V^u((v_i)_{i\le 0})/V^s((v_i)_{i\ge 0})$ *is an s/u-admissible manifold in* v_0.
3. $f[V^s(v_i)_{i\ge 0}] \subset V^s(v_{i+1})_{i\ge 0}$ *and* $f^{-1}[V^u(v_i)_{i\le 0}] \subset V^u(v_{i-1})_{i\le 0}$

(4)

$$V^s((v_i)_{i\geq 0}) = \{p \in \psi_{x_0}[R_{p_0^s}(0)] : \forall k \geq 0, f^k(p) \in \psi_{x_k}[R_{10Q_\epsilon(x_k)}(0)]\}$$
$$V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0}) = \{p \in \psi_{x_0}[R_{p_0^u}(0)] : \forall k \geq 0, f^{-k}(p) \in \psi_{x_{-k}}[R_{10Q_\epsilon(x_{-k})}(0)]\}$$

(5) The maps $(v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \mapsto V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0}), V^s((v_i)_{i\geq 0})$ are Hölder continuous:

$$\exists K > 0, \theta \in (0,1) : \forall n \geq 0, \vec{v}, \vec{w} \text{ chains: if } v_i = w_i \ \forall |i| \leq n \text{ then:}$$

$$dist_{C^1}(V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0}), V^u((w_i)_{i\leq 0})) < K\theta^n, dist_{C^1}(V^s((v_i)_{i\geq 0}), V^s((w_i)_{i\geq 0})) < K\theta^n$$

Proof. Parts (1)–(4) are a modification of Pesin's Stable Manifold Theorem [Pes76], and Sarig's version of it. Part (5) is a modification of Brin's Theorem on the Hölder continuity of the Oseledets distribution [BP01]. Whereas Brin's theorem only states Hölder continuity on Pesin sets, part (5) gives Hölder continuity everywhere, as in Sarig's version.

Parts (1), (3), (4) and (5) are quite similar to the proof of proposition 4.15 in [Sar13], we nonetheless present the proof since the understanding of this proposition is important to the ideas presented in this work.

We show a proof for the case of u manifolds, the stable case is similar:

Part 1: By the Graph Transform theorem $\mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n}^u)$ is a u-admissible manifold in v_0. By the previous proposition for any other choice of u-admissible manifolds W_{-n}^u in v_{-n}:

$$dist(\mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n}^u), \mathcal{F}_u^n(W_{-n}^u)) < e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi n} dist(V_{-n}^u, W_{-n}^u) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi n} 2Q_\epsilon(x) < e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi n}$$

(Since for any admissible manifold the $\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq Q_\epsilon(x)$).

Thus, if the limit exists then it is independent of V_{-n}^u.

For every $n \geq m$:

$$dist(\mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n}^u), \mathcal{F}_u^m(V_{-m}^u)) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-m} dist(\mathcal{F}_u^{m+k}(V_{-m-k}^u), \mathcal{F}_u^{m+k+1}(V_{-m-k-1}^u)) \leq$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-m} dist(\mathcal{F}_u^m(V_{-m}^u), \mathcal{F}_u^{m+1}(V_{-m-1}^u)) e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi k} < \sum_{k=0}^{n-m} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi m} dist(V_0^u, \mathcal{F}_u(V_{-1}^u)) e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi k} \leq$$

$$\leq 2e^{-m\frac{\chi}{2}} \frac{1}{1-e^{-\chi/2}} \underset{m,n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \Big(\because dist(V_0, \mathcal{F}_u(V_{-1}^u)) \leq 2Q_\epsilon(x) < 2 \Big)$$

Hence, this is a Cauchy sequence in a complete space, and therefore converges.

Part 2: Admissibility of the limit: Write $v_0 = \psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$ and let F_n denote the functions which represent $\mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n}^u)$ in v_0. Since $\mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n}^u)$ are u-admissible in v_0, for every n:

- $\|d.F_n\|_{\beta/3} \leq \frac{1}{2}$
- $\|d_0 F_n\| \leq \frac{1}{2}(p^s \wedge p^u)^{\beta/3}$
- $|F_n(0)|_\infty \leq 10^{-3}(p^s \wedge p^u)$

Since $\mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n}^u) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0})$: $F_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} F$ uniformly, where F represents $V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0})$. By the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, $\exists n_k \uparrow \infty$ s.t. $d.F_{n_k} \underset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} L$ uniformly where $\|L\|_{\beta/3} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. For each term in the sequences, the following identity holds:

$$\forall t \in R_{q^u}(0) : \ \vec{F}_{n_k}(t) = \vec{F}_{n_k}(0) + \int_0^1 d_{\lambda t}\vec{F}_{n_k} \cdot t \ d\lambda.$$

Since $d.F_{n_k}$ converge uniformly, we get:

$$\forall t \in R_{q^u}(0) : \ \vec{F}(t) = \vec{F}(0) + \int_0^1 L(\lambda t) \cdot t \ d\lambda$$

In fact the same calculations give us that $\forall s \in R_{q^u}(0)$:

$$\forall t \in R_{q^u}(0): \ \vec{F}(t) = \vec{F}(s) + \int_0^1 L(\lambda(t-s)+s)\cdot(t-s)\ d\lambda =$$

$$= \vec{F}(s) + \int_0^1 [L(\lambda(t-s)+s) - L(s)]\cdot(t-s)\ d\lambda + L(s)\cdot(t-s)$$

Since L is $\beta/3$-Hölder on a compact set, and in particular uniformly continuous, the second summand is a $o(|t-s|)$, and hence $\exists d_t F = L(t)$. We also see that $\{d.F_n\}$ can only have one limit point. Consequently $d.F_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{uniformly} d.F$. So $\|d.F\|_{\beta/3} \le \frac{1}{2}, \|d_0 F\| \le \frac{1}{2}(p^s \wedge p^u)^{\beta/3}$ and $|F(0)|_\infty \le 10^{-3}(p^s \wedge p^u)$, whence the u-admissibility of $V^u((v_i)_{i\le 0})$.

Part 3: Let $V^u := V^u((v_i)_{i\le 0}) = \lim \mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n}^u)$, and $W^u := V^u((v_{i-1})_{i\le 0}) = \lim \mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n-1}^u)$.

$$\begin{aligned} dist(V^u, \mathcal{F}_u(W^u)) \le & dist(V^u, \mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n}^u)) + dist(\mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n}^u), \mathcal{F}_u^{n+1}(V_{-n-1}^u)) + dist(\mathcal{F}_u^{n+1}(V_{-n-1}^u), \mathcal{F}_u(W^u)) \\ \le & dist(V^u, \mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n}^u)) + e^{-\frac{1}{2}n\chi} dist(V_{-n}^u, \mathcal{F}_u(V_{-n-1}^u)) + e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi} dist(\mathcal{F}_u^n(V_{-n-1}^u), W^u). \end{aligned}$$

The first and third summands tend to zero by definition, and the second goes to zero since $dist(V_{-n}^u, \mathcal{F}_u(V_{-n-1}^u)) < 1$. So $V^u = \mathcal{F}_u(W^u) \subset f[W^u]$.

Part 4: The inclusion $\subset$ is simple: Every u-admissible manifold W_i^u in $\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s, p_i^u}$ is contained in $\psi_{x_i}[R_{p_i^u}(0)]$, because if W_i^u is represented by the function F then any $p = \psi_{x_i}(v,w)$ in W_i^u satisfies $|w|_\infty \le p_i^u$ and

$$|v|_\infty = |F(w)|_\infty \le |F(0)|_\infty + max\|d.F\| \cdot |w|_\infty \le \varphi + \epsilon \cdot |w|_\infty \le (10^{-3} + \epsilon) p_i^u < p_i^u$$

Applying this to $V^u := V^u[(v_i)_{i\le 0}]$, we see that for every $p \in V^u$, $p \in \psi_{x_0}[R_{p_0^u}(0)]$.

Hence by part 3 for every $k \ge 0$:

$$f^{-k}(p) \in f^{-k}[V^u] \subset V^u[(v_{i-k})_{i\le 0}] \subset \psi_{x_{-k}}[R_{p_{-k}^u}(0)] \subset \psi_{x_{-k}}[R_{10Q_\epsilon(x_{-k})}(0)]$$

So now to prove $\supset$: Suppose $z \in \psi_{x_0}[R_{p_0^u}(0)]$ and $f^{-k}(z) \in \psi_{x_{-k}}[R_{10Q_\epsilon(x_{-k})}(0)]$ for all $k \ge 0$. Write $z = \psi_{x_0}(v_0, w_0)$. We show that $z \in V^u$ by proving that $v_0 = F(w_0)$ where F is the representing function for V^u: For this purpose we will use $z' := \psi_{x_0}(F(w_0), w_0) := \psi_{x_0}(v', w')$. For $k \ge 0$ $f^{-k}(z), f^{-k}(z') \in \psi_{x_{-k}}[R_{10Q_\epsilon(x_{-k})}(0)]$ (the first point by assumption, and the second since $f^{-k}(z') \in f^{-k}[V^u] \subset V^u((v_i)_{i-k})_{i\le 0})$. It is therefore possible to write:

$$f^{-k}(z) = \psi_{x_{-k}}(v_{-k}, w_{-k}) \text{ and } f^{-k}(z') = \psi_{x_{-k}}(v'_k, w'_k)\ (k \ge 0)$$

where $|v_{-k}|_\infty, |w_{-k}|_\infty, |v'_{-k}|_\infty, |w'_{-k}|_\infty \le 10Q_\epsilon(x_{-k})$ for all $k \ge 0$.

By proposition 1.2.4 for f^{-1} we get that $\forall k \ge 0$ $f^{-1}_{x_{-k-1}x_{-k}} = \psi^{-1}_{x_{-k-1}} \circ f^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_{-k}}$ can be written as

$$f^{-1}_{x_{-k-1}x_{-k}}(v,w) = (D_{s,k}^{-1} v + h_{s,k}(v,w), D_{u,k}^{-1} w + h_{u,k}(v,w)),$$

where $\|D_{s,k}\|^{-1} \ge e^{\chi/2}$, $\|D_{u,k}^{-1}\| \le e^{-\chi/2}$, and $\max_{R_{10Q_\epsilon(x_{-k})}(0)} \|d.h_{s/u,k}\| < \epsilon$ (provided ϵ is small enough). Define $\Delta v_{-k} := v_{-k} - v'_{-k}$, and $\Delta w_{-k} := w_{-k} - w'_{-k}$. Since for every $k \le 0$, $(v_{-k-1}, w_{-k-1}) = f^{-1}_{x_{-k-1}x_{-k}}(v_{-k}, w_{-k})$ and $(v'_{-k-1}, w'_{-k-1}) = f^{-1}_{x_{-k-1}x_{-k}}(v'_{-k}, w'_{-k})$ we get the two following bounds:

$$|\Delta v_{-k-1}|_\infty \ge \|D_{s,k}\|^{-1} \cdot |\Delta v_{-k}|_\infty - \max\|d.h_{s,k}\| \cdot (|\Delta v_{-k}|_\infty + |\Delta w_{-k}|_\infty) \ge (e^{\chi/2} - \epsilon)|v_{-k}|_\infty - \epsilon|\Delta w_{-k}|_\infty$$

$$|\Delta w_{-k-1}|_\infty \le \|D_{u,k}^{-1}\| \cdot |\Delta w_{-k}|_\infty + \max\|d.h_{u,k}\| \cdot (|\Delta w_{-k}|_\infty + |\Delta v_{-k}|_\infty) \le (e^{-\chi/2} + \epsilon)|w_{-k}|_\infty + \epsilon|\Delta v_{-k}|_\infty$$

Denote $a_k := |\Delta v_{-k}|_\infty, b_k := |\Delta w_{-k}|_\infty$ and assume that ϵ is small enough that $e^{-\chi/2} + \epsilon \le e^{-\chi/3}, e^{\chi/2} - \epsilon \ge e^{\chi/3}$ then we get (since $b_0 \equiv 0$):

$$a_{k+1} \ge e^{\chi/3} a_k - \epsilon b_k, b_{k+1} \le e^{-\chi/3} b_k + \epsilon a_k$$

Assume ϵ is small enough so that $e^{\chi/3} - \epsilon > 1, e^{-\chi/3} + \epsilon < 1$ then we claim $a_k \le a_{k+1}, b_k \le a_k \forall k \ge 0$:

Proof by induction: it is true for $k = 0$ since $b_0 = 0$. Assume the induction step, then:

$$b_{k+1} \le e^{-\chi/3} b_k + \epsilon a_k \le (e^{-\chi/3} + \epsilon) a_k \le a_k \le a_{k+1}$$

$$a_{k+2} \geq e^{\chi/3}a_{k+1} - \epsilon b_{k+1} \geq (e^{\chi/3} - \epsilon)a_{k+1} \geq a_{k+1}$$

We see that $a_{k+1} \geq (e^{\chi/3} - \epsilon)a_k$ for all $k \geq 0$, hence $a_k \geq (e^{\chi/3} - \epsilon)^k a_0$. Either $a_k \to \infty$ or $a_0 = 0$. But $a_k = |v_{-k} - v'_{-k}|_\infty \leq 20Q_\epsilon(x_{-k}) < 20\epsilon$, so $a_0 = 0$, and therefore $v_0 = v'_0$, meaning $F(w'_0) = F(w_0)$, thus

$$z = \psi_x(F(w_0), w_0) \in V^u$$

Which concludes this part.

Part 5: If two chains $v = (v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}, w = (w_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfy $v_i = w_i$ for $|i| \leq N$ then $dist(V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0}), V^u((w_i)_{i\leq 0})) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}N\chi}$: Given $n > N$ let V^u_{-n} be a u-admissible manifold in v_{-n}, and let W^u_{-n} be a u-admissible manifold in w_{-n}. $\mathcal{F}^{n-N}_u(V^u_{-n})$ and $\mathcal{F}^{n-N}_u(W^u_{-n})$ are u-admissible manifolds in $v_{-N}(= w_{-N})$. Let F_N, G_N be their representing functions. Admissibility implies that

$$\|F_N - G_N\|_\infty \leq \|F_N\|_\infty + \|G_N\|_\infty < 2Q_\epsilon < 1$$

$$\|d.F_N - d.G_N\|_\infty \leq \|d.F_N\|_\infty + \|d.G_N\|_\infty < 2\epsilon < 1$$

Represent $\mathcal{F}^{n-k}_u(V^u_{-n})$ and $\mathcal{F}^{n-k}_u(W^u_{-n})$ by F_k and G_k: by the previous proposition we get

$$\|F_{k-1} - G_{k-1}\|_\infty \leq e^{-\chi/2}\|F_k - G_k\|_\infty$$

$$\|d.F_{k-1} - d.G_{k-1}\|_\infty \leq e^{-\chi/2}(\|d.F_k - d.G_k\|_\infty + 2\|F_k - G_k\|^{\beta/3}_\infty)$$

Iterating the first inequality, from $k = N$, going down, we get: $\|F_k - G_k\|_\infty \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}(n-k)\chi}$. So:

$$dist(\mathcal{F}^n_u(V^u_{-n}), \mathcal{F}^n_u(W^u_{-n})) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}N\chi}$$

Passing to the limit as $n \to \infty$ we get:

$$dist(V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0}), V^u((w_i)_{i\leq 0})) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}N\chi}$$

Now plug $\|F_k - G_k\|_\infty \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi(N-k)}$ in $\|d.F_{k-1} - d.G_{k-1}\|_\infty \leq e^{-\chi/2}(\|d.F_k - d.G_k\|_\infty + 2\|F_k - G_k\|^{\beta/3}_\infty)$, and set $c_k := \|d.F_k - d.G_k\|_\infty, \theta_1 = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi}, \theta_2 = e^{-\frac{1}{6}\beta\chi}$ then:

$$c_{k-1} \leq \theta_1(c_k + 2\theta_2^{N-k})$$

hence (by induction):

$\forall 0 \leq k \leq N$: $c_0 \leq \theta_1^k c_k + 2(\theta_1^k\theta_2^{N-k} + \theta_1^{k-1}\theta_2^{N-k+1} + ... + \theta_1\theta_2^{N-1})$. Now substitute $k = N$, and remember $\theta_1 < \theta_2, c_N \leq 1$: $c_0 \leq \theta_1^N + 2N\theta_2^N < (2N+1)\theta_2^N$.

It follows that $dist_{C^1}(\mathcal{F}^n_u(V^u_{-n}), \mathcal{F}^n_u(W^u_{-n})) \leq 2(N+1)\theta_2^N$. In part 2 we saw that $\mathcal{F}^n_u(V^u_{-n})$ and $\mathcal{F}^n_u(W^u_{-n})$ converge to $V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0})$ and $V^u((w_i)_{i\leq 0})$ (resp.) in C^1. Therefore if we pass to the limit as $n \to \infty$ we get

$dist_{C^1}(V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0}), V^u((w_i)_{i\leq 0})) \leq 2(N+1)\theta_2^N$. Now pick $\theta \in (\theta_2, 1), K > 0$ s.t. $2(N+1)\theta_2^N \leq K\theta^N$ $\forall N$. □

Theorem 1.3.21. *Given a chain of double charts $(v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ let $\pi((\underline{v})) :=$unique intersection point of $V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0})$ and $V^s((v_i)_{i\geq 0})$. Then*

1. *π is well-defined and $\pi \circ \sigma = f \circ \pi$.*
2. *$\pi : \Sigma \to M$ is Hölder continuous.*
3. *$\pi[\Sigma] \supset \pi[\Sigma^\#] \supset NUH^\#_\chi(f)$, therefore $\pi[\Sigma]$ and $\pi[\Sigma^\#]$ have full probability w.r.t any hyperbolic invariant measure with Lyapunov exponents bounded from 0 by χ.*

Proof. Part 1: π is well-defined thanks to proposition 1.3.13. Now, write $v_i = \psi^{p^s_i, p^u_i}_{x_i}$ and $z = \pi((\underline{v}))$. We claim that $f^k(z) \in \psi_{x_k}[R_{Q_\epsilon(x_k)}(0)]$ $(k \in \mathbb{Z})$: For $k = 0$ this is true because $z \in V^s((v_i)_{i\geq 0})$, and that is an s-admissible manifold in $\psi^{p^s_0, p^u_0}_{x_0}$. For $k > 0$ we use the previous proposition (part 3) to see that

$$f^k(z) \in f^k[V^s((v_i)_{i\geq 0})] \subset V^s((v_{i+k})_{i\geq 0}).$$

Since $V^s((v_{i+k})_{i\geq 0})$ is an s-admissible manifold in $\psi^{p^s_k, p^u_k}_{x_k}$ then $f^k(z) \in \psi_{x_k}[R_{Q_\epsilon(x_k)}(0)]$. The case $k < 0$ can be handled the same way, using $V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0})$. Thus z satisfies:

$$f^k(z) \in \psi_{x_k}[R_{Q_\epsilon(x_k)}(0)] \ (k \in \mathbb{Z}).$$

Any point which satisfies this must be z, since by the previous proposition (part 4) it must lay in $V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0})\cap V^s((v_i)_{i\geq 0})$, so this equation characterizes $\pi(\underline{v})=z$. Hence:

$$f^k(f(\pi(\underline{v})))=f^{k+1}(\pi(\underline{v}))\in\psi^{p^s_{k+1},p^u_{k+1}}_{x_{k+1}}\ \forall k$$

and this is the condition that characterizes $\pi(\sigma\underline{v})$.

Part 2: We saw that $\underline{v}\mapsto V^u((v_i)_{i\leq 0})$ and $\underline{v}\mapsto V^s((v_i)_{i\geq 0})$ are Hölder continuous (previous proposition). Since the intersection of an s-admissible manifold and a u-admissible manifold is a Lipschitz function of those manifolds (proposition 1.3.20), π is also Hölder continuous.

Part3: We prove $\pi[\Sigma]\supset NUH^{\#}_{\chi}(f)$: Suppose $x\in NUH^{\#}_{\chi}(f)$, then by the last proposition there's a $\psi^{p^s_k,p^u_k}_{x_k}\in\mathcal{V}$ s.t. $\psi^{p^s_k,p^u_k}_{x_k}\to\psi^{p^s_{k+1},p^u_{k+1}}_{x_{k+1}}$ for all k, and s.t. $\psi^{p^s_k,p^u_k}_{x_k}$ $\epsilon-$overlaps $\psi^{p^s_k\wedge p^u_k}_{f^k(x)}$ for all $k\in\mathbb{Z}$. This implies

$$f^k(z)=\psi_{f^k(x)}(0)\in\psi_{f^k(x)}[R_{p^s_k\wedge p^u_k}(0)]\subset\psi_{f^k(x)}[R_{Q_\epsilon(x_k)}(0)]$$

Then x satisfies $f^k(z)\in\psi_{x_k}[R_{Q_\epsilon(x_k)}(0)]$ ($k\in\mathbb{Z}$). It follows that $x=\pi(\underline{v})$ with $\underline{v}=(\psi^{p^s_i,p^u_i}_{x_i})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$. In fact prop. 1.3.8 gives a chain s.t. $p^s_i\wedge p^u_i\geq e^{-\epsilon/3}q_\epsilon(f^i(x))$. By the definition of $NUH^{\#}_{\chi}(f)$ there exists a sequence $i_k,j_k\uparrow\infty$ for which $p^s_{i_k}\wedge p^u_{i_k}$ and $p^s_{-j_k}\wedge p^u_{-j_k}$ are bounded away from zero. By the discreteness property of $\mathcal{A}$ (prop. 1.2.5), $\psi^{p^s_i,p^u_i}_{x_i}$ must repeat some symbol infinitely often in the past, (possibly a different symbol) in the future. Thus the above actually proves that

$$\pi[\Sigma^{\#}]\supset NUH^{\#}_{\chi}(f)$$

where $\Sigma^{\#}=\{\underline{v}\in\Sigma:\exists v,w\in\mathcal{V},n_k,m_k\uparrow\infty\text{ s.t. }v_{n_k}=v,v_{-m_k}=w\}$. □

1.3.4. *The relevant part of the extension.*

Definition 1.3.22. *A double chart $v=\psi^{p^s,p^u}_x$ is called* relevant *iff there exists a chain $(v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ s.t. $v_0=v$ and $\pi(\underline{v})\in NUH^{\#}_{\chi}(f)$. A double chart which is not relevant is called* irrelevant.

Definition 1.3.23. The relevant part of Σ *is* $\Sigma_{rel}:=\{\underline{v}\in\Sigma:v_i\text{ is relevant for all }i\}$. *Define this as all 'regular' chains of* Σ.

Proposition 1.3.24. *The previous theorem holds with Σ_{rel} replacing Σ.*

Proof. All the properties of $\pi:\Sigma_{rel}\to M$ are obvious, besides the statement that $\pi[\Sigma^{\#}_{rel}]\supset NUH^{\#}_{\chi}(f)$, where $\Sigma^{\#}_{rel}=\Sigma^{\#}\cap\Sigma_{rel}$: Suppose $p\in NUH^{\#}_{\chi}(f)$, then the proof of the last proposition shows that $\exists\underline{v}\in\Sigma^{\#}$ s.t. $\pi(\underline{v})=p$. Since $NUH^{\#}_{\chi}(f)$ is f-invariant and $f\circ\pi=\pi\circ\sigma$ then $\pi(\sigma^i(\underline{v}))=f^i(p)\in NUH^{\#}_{\chi}(f)$. So v_i is relevant for all $i\in\mathbb{Z}$. It follows that $v\in\Sigma^{\#}_{rel}$. □

2. Regular chains which shadow the same orbit are close

2.1. **The inverse problem for regular chains.** The aim of this part is to show that the map $\pi:\Sigma^{\#}_{rel}\to NUH_{\chi}$ from theorem 1.3.21, is "almost invertible". Meaning, we aim to show that if $\pi((\psi^{p^s_i,p^u_i}_{x_i})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})=\pi((\psi^{q^s_i,q^u_i}_{y_i})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})$, then those two chains must be close- $\forall i$: $x_i\sim y_i$, $p^{s/u}_i\sim q^{s/u}_i$ and $C_\chi(x_i)\sim C_\chi(y_i)$- the respective parameters belong to the same compact sets. The compact sets can be as small as we wish by choosing small enough ϵ. The discretization we constructed in §1.2.3 gives that in fact the compact sets contain a finite number of such possible parameters for our charts. Moreover, we will get that π can be refined to be finite-to-1.

2.1.1. *Comparing orbits of tangent vectors.*

Proposition 2.1.1. *Let $(\psi^{p^s_i,p^u_i}_{x_i})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}},(\psi^{q^s_i,q^u_i}_{y_i})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be two chains s.t. $\pi((\psi^{p^s_i,p^u_i}_{x_i})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})=\pi((\psi^{q^s_i,q^u_i}_{y_i})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})=x$ then $d(x_i,y_i)<25^{-1}\max\{p^s_i\wedge p^u_i,q^s_i\wedge q^u_i\}$*

Proof. $f^i(x)$ is the intersection of a u-admissible manifold and an s-admissible manifold in $\psi^{p^s_i,p^u_i}_{x_i}$, therefore (by prop. 1.3.13) $f^i(x)=\psi_{x_i}(v_i,w_i)$ where $|v_i|_\infty,|w_i|_\infty<10^{-2}(p^s_i\wedge p^u_i)$. By construction Pesin charts are 2-Lipschitz, therefore $d(f^i(x),x_i)<50^{-1}(p^s_i\wedge p^u_i)$. Similarly $d(f^i(x),y_i)<50^{-1}(q^s_i\wedge q^u_i)$. It follows that $d(x_i,y_i)<\frac{1}{25}\max\{q^s_i\wedge q^u_i,p^s_i\wedge p^u_i\}$. □

The following definitions are taken from [Sar13].

Definition 2.1.2. *Let V^u be a u-admissible manifold in the double chart $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$. We say that V^u* stays in windows *if there exists a negative chain $(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u})_{i\le 0}$ with $\psi_{x_0}^{p_0^s,p_0^u}=\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$ and u-admissible manifolds W_i^u in $\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u}$ s.t. $f^{-|i|}[V_i^u]\subset W_i^u$ for all $i\le 0$.*

Definition 2.1.3. *Let V^s be an s-admissible manifold in the double chart $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$. We say that V^s* stays in windows *if there exists a positive chain $(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u})_{i\ge 0}$ with $\psi_{x_0}^{p_0^s,p_0^u}=\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$ and s-admissible manifolds W_i^s in $\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u}$ s.t. $f^i[V_i^u]\subset W_i^s$ for all $i\ge 0$.*

Remark: If $\underline{v}$ is a chain, then $V_i^u:=V^u((v_k)_{k\le i})$ and $V_i^s:=V^s((v_k)_{k\ge i})$ stay in windows, since $f^{-k}[V_i^u]\subset V_{i-k}^u$ and $f^k[V_i^s]\subset V_{i=k}^s$ for all $k\ge 0$ (by prop. 1.3.16).

Proposition 2.1.4. *The following holds for all ϵ small enough: Let V^s be an admissible s-manifold in $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$, and suppose V^s stays in windows.*

(1) For every $y,z\in V^s$: $d(f^k(y),f^k(z))<e^{-\frac{1}{2}k\chi}$ for all $k\ge 0$.
(2) For every $y\in V^s$ and $u\in T_yV^s(1)$: $|d_yf^ku|_\infty\le 4e^{-k\frac{2\chi}{3}}\|C_\chi(x)^{-1}\|$
Recall: $T_yV^s(1)$ is the unit ball in T_yV^s, w.r.t the Riemannian norm.
(3) For all $y,z\in V^s\exists\Lambda:T_yV^s\to T_zV^s$ linear and invertible s.t. $\forall u_y\in T_yV^s(1)$, $k\ge 0$:

$$|\log|d_yf^ku_y|_\infty-\log|d_zf^k\Lambda u_y|_\infty|<\frac{1}{3}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}$$

Notice that from the third list item, we get in particular that $\forall u\in T_yV^s:\frac{S(y,u)}{S(z,\Lambda u)},\frac{|u|}{|\Lambda u|}=e^{\pm\frac{1}{3}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}}$.

The symmetric statement holds for u-admissible manifolds which stay in windows, for "s" replaced by "u" and f by f^{-1}.

Proof. Suppose V^s is an s-admissible manifold in $\psi_{x_0}^{p^s,p^u}$, which stays in windows, then there is a positive chain $(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u})_{i\ge 0}$ s.t. $\psi_{x_0}^{p_0^s,p_0^u}=\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$, and there are s-admissible manifolds W_i^s in $\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u}$ s.t. $f^i[V^s]\subset W_i^s$ for all $i\ge 0$. We write:

- $V^s=\{(t,F_0(t)):|t|_\infty\le p^s\}$
- $W_i^s=\psi_{x_i}[\{(t,F_i(t)):|t|_\infty\le p_i^s\}]$
- $\eta_i:=p_i^s\wedge p_i^s$

Admissibility means that $\|d.F_i\|_{\beta/3}\le\frac{1}{2},\|d_0F_i\|\le\frac{1}{2}\eta_i^{\beta/3}$ and $|F_i(0)|_\infty\le 10^{-3}\eta_i$. By lemma 1.3.4 :$\frac{\eta_i}{\eta_{i+1}}\in[e^{-\epsilon},e^{\epsilon}]$, $\mathrm{Lip}(F_i)<\epsilon$

Part 1: If ϵ is small enough that $e^{-\chi}+4\epsilon^2<e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}}$, then for every $y,z\in V^s$: $d(f^k(y),f^k(z))\le 4p_0^se^{-\frac{1}{2}k\chi}$ for all $k\ge 0$.

Proof: Since V^s stays in windows: $f^k[V^s]\subset\psi_{x_k}[R_{Q_\epsilon(x_k)}(0)]$ for all $k\ge 0$. Therefore $\forall y,z\in V^s$ one can write $f^k(y)=\psi_{x_k}(y_k')$ and $f^k(z)=\psi_{x_k}(z_k')$, where $y_k'=(y_k,F_k(y_k)),z_k'=(z_k,F_k(z_k))$ and they belong to $R_{Q_\epsilon(x_k)}(0)$. For every k: $y_{k+1}'=f_{x_kx_{k+1}}(y_k')$ and $z_{k+1}'=f_{x_kx_{k+1}}(z_k')$. (Reminder: $f_{x_kx_{k+1}}=\psi_{x_{k+1}}^{-1}\circ f\circ\psi_{x_k}$).

$$f_{x_kx_{k+1}}(v,w)=(D_{s,k}v+h_s^{(k)}(v,w),D_{u,k}w+h_u^{(k)}v,w)\text{ on }R_{Q_\epsilon(x_k)}(0)$$

Recall from proposition 1.2.4, $\|D_{s,k}\|,\|D_{u,k}^{-1}\|\le e^{-\chi},\|D_{u,k}\|,\|D_{s,k}^{-1}\|\le\kappa,\max\|d.h_{s/u}^{(k)}\|\le 3\epsilon^2$. Thus:

$$|y_{k+1}-z_{k+1}|_\infty\le\|D_{s,k}\|\cdot|y_k-z_k|_\infty+3\epsilon^2(|y_k-z_k|_\infty+\mathrm{Lip}(F_k)|y_k-z_k|_\infty)\le$$

$$\le(e^{-\chi}+4\epsilon^2)|y_k-z_k|_\infty<e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi}|y_k-z_k|_\infty\le\ldots\le e^{-\frac{1}{2}(k+1)\chi}|y_0-z_0|_\infty$$

Since y_0',z_0' are on the graph of an s-admissible manifold in $\psi_{x_0}^{p_0^u,p_0^s}$, their stable components are in $R_{p_0^s}(0)$, so $|y_0-z_0|\le 2p_0^s$. So we get: $|y_k-z_k|_\infty\le 2e^{-\frac{1}{2}k\chi}p_0^s$. Now since $y_k'=(y_k,F_k(y_k)),z_k'=(z_k,F_k(z_k))$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(F_k)<\epsilon<1$: $|y_k'-z_k'|_\infty\le 2e^{-\frac{1}{2}k\chi}p_0^s$. Pesin charts have Lipschitz constant less than 2, so $d(f^k(y),f^k(z))<4p_0^se^{-\frac{1}{2}k\chi}$

Part 2: We assume ϵ is small enough that $e^{-\chi}+3\epsilon^2 \le e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}}$. Let $y \in V^s$ and let $u \in T_yV^s(1)$ some unit vector tangent to V^s. $f^k(y) \in W^s_k \subset \psi_{x_k}[R_{Q_\epsilon(x_k)}(0)]$, so $d_yf^ku = d_{y'_k}\psi_{x_k}\begin{pmatrix}\xi_k\\ \eta_k\end{pmatrix}$ where $\begin{pmatrix}\xi_k\\ \eta_k\end{pmatrix}$ is tangent to the graph of F_k. Since $\mathrm{Lip}(F_k)<\epsilon$: $|\eta_k|_\infty \le \epsilon|\xi_k|_\infty$ for all k.

$$\begin{pmatrix}\xi_{k+1}\\ \eta_{k+1}\end{pmatrix} = \Big[\begin{pmatrix}D_{s,k} & \\ & D_{u,k}\end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix}d_{y'_k}h^{(k)}_s\\ d_{y'_k}h^{(k)}_u\end{pmatrix}\Big]\begin{pmatrix}\xi_k\\ \eta_k\end{pmatrix}$$

where the left multipliers on the RHS are block matrices as denoted. So we get:

$$|\xi_{k+1}|_\infty \le (e^{-\chi}+3\epsilon^2)|\xi_k|_\infty \le e^{-2\chi/3}|\xi_k|_\infty \le e^{-k\frac{2\chi}{3}}|\xi_0|_\infty.$$

Returning to the defining relation $d_yf^ku = d_{y'_k}\psi_{x_k}\begin{pmatrix}\xi_k\\ \eta_k\end{pmatrix}$, and recalling that $\|d_\cdot\psi_{x_k}\| \le 2$ we see that:

$$2e^{-k\frac{2\chi}{3}}|\xi_0|_\infty \ (\because \mathrm{Lip}(F_k)<\epsilon \text{ w.r.t sup norm, on domain and target}) \le 2e^{-k\frac{2\chi}{3}}\|\psi^{-1}_{x_0}\| \le$$

$$\le 4e^{-k\frac{2\chi}{3}}\|C_\chi(x_0)^{-1}\| \text{ (because for } \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}\rho: \ \|d_x\exp^{-1}\| \le 2)$$

So we get $|d_yf^ku|_\infty \le 4e^{-k\frac{2\chi}{3}}\|C_\chi(x_0)^{-1}\|$ as wished.

Part 3: There exists a unique $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{s(x)}$ s.t. $u_y = d_{y'_0}\psi_{x_0}\begin{pmatrix}\xi_0\\ d_{y_0}F_0\xi_0\end{pmatrix}$. We define $u_z := \Lambda u_y := d_{z'_0}\psi_{x_0}\begin{pmatrix}\xi_0\\ d_{z_0}F_0\xi_0\end{pmatrix}$. Notice that $\Lambda : T_yV^s \to T_zV^s$ is indeed a linear invertible transformation.

In this part we reassign the symbols ξ_k, η_k. First, define:

$$\xi_{k+1} := \pi_{\mathbb{R}^{s(x)}}d_{y'_0}(f_{x_kx_{k+1}}\circ ... \circ f_{x_0x_1})\begin{pmatrix}\xi_0\\ d_{y_0}F_0\xi_0\end{pmatrix},$$

$$\eta_{k+1} := \pi_{\mathbb{R}^{s(x)}}d_{z'_0}(f_{x_kx_{k+1}}\circ ... \circ f_{x_0x_1})\begin{pmatrix}\xi_0\\ d_{z_0}F_0\xi_0\end{pmatrix},$$

where $\pi_{\mathbb{R}^{s(x)}}$ is the projection into the first $s(x)$ coordinates; and is identified with its differential. We claim that: for some constant $C(\chi,\beta)$ depending only on χ and β

$$\Big|\begin{pmatrix}\xi_k\\ d_{y_k}F_k\xi_k\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix}\eta_k\\ d_{z_k}F_k\eta_k\end{pmatrix}\Big|_\infty \le C(\chi,\beta)(p^s_0)^{\beta/3}e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}k}. \tag{6}$$

Proof: Define $g_k = f_{x_{k-1}x_k}\circ ... \circ f_{x_0x_1}$. By definition, and since $|d_{z_0}F_0\xi_0|_\infty \le |\xi_0|$

$$\begin{aligned}|\xi_{k+1}-\eta_{k+1}|_\infty \le& \|d_{y'_0}g_{k+1}-d_{z'_0}g_{k+1}\|\cdot\Big|\begin{pmatrix}\xi_0\\ d_{z_0}F_0\xi_0\end{pmatrix}\Big|_\infty + \|d_{y'_0}g_{k+1}\|\cdot\|d_{z_0}F_0-d_{y_0}F_0\|\cdot|\xi_0|_\infty\\ =&\|d_{y'_0}g_{k+1}-d_{z'_0}g_{k+1}\|\cdot|\xi_0|_\infty + \|d_{y'_0}g_{k+1}\|\cdot\|d_{z_0}F_0-d_{y_0}F_0\|\cdot|\xi_0|_\infty\\ =&\|d_{y'_0}g_{k+1}-d_{z'_0}g_{k+1}\| + \|d_{y'_0}g_{k+1}\|\cdot\|d_{z_0}F_0-d_{y_0}F_0\|.\end{aligned}$$

We call the left term on the RHS M_{k+1}, and estimate it:

$$\begin{aligned}M_{k+1} =&\|d_{g_k(y'_0)}f_{x_kx_{k+1}}d_{y'_0}g_k - d_{g_k(z'_0)}f_{x_kx_{k+1}}d_{z'_0}g_k\|\\ \le&\|d_{g_k(y'_0)}f_{x_kx_{k+1}}d_{y'_0}g_k - d_{g_k(y'_0)}f_{x_kx_{k+1}}d_{z'_0}g_k\| + \|d_{g_k(y'_0)}f_{x_kx_{k+1}}d_{z'_0}g_k - d_{g_k(z'_0)}f_{x_kx_{k+1}}d_{z'_0}g_k\|\end{aligned}$$

Left Summand $\le \|d_{g_k(y'_0)}f_{x_kx_{k+1}}\|M_k = \|d_{y'_k}f_{x_kx_{k+1}}\|M_k$

Right Summand $\le \mathrm{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d_\cdot f_{x_kx_{k+1}})|g_k(y'_0)-g_k(z'_0)|^{\beta/3}\|d_{z'_0}g_k\| = \mathrm{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d_\cdot f_{x_kx_{k+1}})|y'_k-z'_k|^{\beta/3}\|d_{z'_0}g_k\|$.

Now, by the proof of prop. 1.2.4: $\forall v,u \in R_{Q_\epsilon(x)}(0) : \|d_uf_{xy}-d_vf_{xy}\| \le \frac{1}{3}\epsilon|u-v|^{\frac{\beta}{3}}$, and recall $f_{x_k} = f_{x_kf(x_k)} = \psi^{-1}_{f(x_k)}\circ f\circ\psi_{x_k}$, so:

$$\begin{aligned}\|d_{y'_k}f_{x_kx_{k+1}}\| \le&\|d_0f_{x_kx_{k+1}}\| + |y'_k-0|^{\beta/3}\frac{1}{3}\epsilon = \|d_0\Big((\psi^{-1}_{x_{k+1}}\circ\psi_{f(x_k)})f_{x_k}\Big)\| + |y'_k|^{\beta/3}\frac{\epsilon}{3}\\ =&\|d_0(\psi^{-1}_{x_{k+1}}\circ\psi_{f(x_k)})d_0f_{x_k}\| + |y'_k|^{\beta/3}\frac{\epsilon}{3} = \|d_0(\psi^{-1}_{x_{k+1}}\circ\psi_{f(x_k)})D_\chi(x_k)\| + |y'_k|^{\beta/3}\frac{\epsilon}{3}.\end{aligned}$$

Remark: the norm of the first summand can actually be taken just over tangent vectors of the form $\begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ d_{y_k}F_k\xi \end{pmatrix}$; and in lemma 1.2.3 we actually saw $d_{C^1}(\psi^{-1}_{x_{k+1}} \circ \psi_{f(x_k)}, Id) \leq 2p^s_k p^s_{k+1}$, so we can continue to bound the expression the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}\|d_{y'_k} f_{x_k x_{k+1}}\| \leq & 2p^s_k p^s_{k+1}\kappa + \|D_s(x_k)\| + \|D_u(x_k)\| \cdot \|d_{y_k}F_k\| + |y'_k|^{\beta/3}\frac{\epsilon}{3} \\ \leq & 2p^s_k p^s_{k+1}\kappa + e^{-\chi} + \kappa\cdot\epsilon + (p^s_k)^{\beta/3}\frac{\epsilon}{3} \leq 2\epsilon^2\kappa + e^{-\chi} + \kappa\cdot\epsilon + \epsilon^{\beta/3}\frac{\epsilon}{3}.\end{aligned}$$

So for small enough ϵ this is less than $e^{-2\chi/3}$. Thus:

$$M_{k+1} \leq e^{-2\chi/3}M_k + \frac{1}{3}\epsilon\cdot(2e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}k}p^s_0)^{\beta/3}\|d_{z'_0}g_k\|$$

Notice that by the bound we have found for $\|d_{y'_k}f_{x_k x_{k+1}}\|$, we get that $\|d_{y'_0}g_k\| \leq e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}(k-1)}\|d_{y'_0}f_{x_0x_1}\| \leq e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}k}$ (and the same for z'_0). Substituting this into the bound we found for M_{k+1} gives

$$\begin{aligned}M_{k+1} \leq & e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}}M_k + (p^s_0)^{\beta/3}\cdot e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}k} \\ \leq & e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}}((p^s_0)^{\beta/3}e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}(k-1)} + e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}}M_{k-1}) + e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}k}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3} \text{ and by recursion} \\ \leq & \ldots \leq e^{-k\frac{\chi}{2}}M_1 + (p^s_0)^{\beta/3}\sum_{j=1}^{k} e^{-j2\chi/3-(k-j)2\chi/3} = e^{-k\frac{2\chi}{3}}M_1 + (p^s_0)^{\beta/3}ke^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}k}\end{aligned}$$

Notice $M_1 = \|d_{y'_0}f_{x_0x_1} - d_{z'_0}f_{x_0x_1}\| \leq \frac{1}{3}\epsilon|y'_0 - z'_0|^{\beta/3}_\infty = \frac{1}{3}\epsilon|y_0 - z_0|^{\beta/3}_\infty \leq \frac{1}{3}\epsilon(2p^s_0)^{\beta/3}$, hence

$$M_{k+1} \leq e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}k}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3}(\frac{1}{3}\epsilon + k) \leq e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}k}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3}e^{\frac{\chi}{6}}e^{-\frac{\chi}{6}(k+1)}(k+1) \leq e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}k}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3}e^{\frac{\chi}{6}}\frac{1}{\frac{\chi}{6}e} \leq \frac{3}{\chi}e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}k}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3}.$$

The penultimate transition is due to the equality $\max_{x\geq 0}\{e^{-\alpha x}x\} = \frac{1}{e\alpha}$, and the ultimate transition is due to the inequality $\frac{6}{e}e^{\frac{\chi}{6}} \leq 3$, for small enough χ.

So returning to $|\xi_{k+1} - \eta_{k+1}|_\infty$:

$$\begin{aligned}|\xi_{k+1} - \eta_{k+1}|_\infty \leq & M_{k+1} + \|d_{y'_0}g_{k+1}\| \cdot \|d_{y_0}F_0 - d_{z_0}F_0\| \leq \frac{3}{\chi}e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}k}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3} + e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}k}\text{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d.F_0)\cdot|y_0 - z_0| \leq \\ & \leq \frac{3}{\chi}e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}k}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3} + e^{-\frac{2\chi}{3}k}\frac{1}{2}\cdot 2p^s_0 \leq (\frac{3}{\chi} + \frac{1}{2})e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}k}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3}. \qquad (7)\end{aligned}$$

Now to prove the claim of Eq. (6):

$$\begin{aligned}|\begin{pmatrix} \xi_k \\ d_{y_k}F_k\xi_k \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \eta_k \\ d_{z_k}F_k\eta_k \end{pmatrix}|_\infty \leq & |\begin{pmatrix} \xi_k - \eta_k \\ d_{y_k}F_k(\xi_k - \eta_k) \end{pmatrix}|_\infty + |\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ (d_{y_k}F_k - d_{z_k}F_k)\eta_k \end{pmatrix}|_\infty \leq \\ & \leq (\because \text{Lip}(F_k) < \epsilon)|\xi_k - \eta_k|_\infty + \text{Höl}_{\beta/3}(d.F_k)|y_k - z_k|^{\beta/3}.\end{aligned}$$

By the calculations in part (1): $|y_k - z_k|^{\beta/3} \leq (2e^{-\chi/2k}p^s_0)^{\beta/3}$; and from admissibility: $\text{Höl}_{\beta/3} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. By substituting these together with Eq. 7 we get

$$|\begin{pmatrix} \xi_k \\ d_{y_k}F_k\xi_k \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \eta_k \\ d_{z_k}F_k\eta_k \end{pmatrix}|_\infty \leq (\frac{3}{\chi} + \frac{1}{2})e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}(k-1)}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3} + 2^{\beta/3}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3}e^{-\frac{\beta\chi}{6}k} \leq ((\frac{3}{\chi} + \frac{1}{2})e^{\frac{\chi}{2}} + 2^{\beta/3})e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}k}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3} \equiv$$

$$\equiv C(\chi,\beta)e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}k}(p^s_0)^{\beta/3}, \text{ as claimed in Eq. (6).}$$

Now to continue the proof of part 3: Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and denote $A := \left|\log|d_y f^n u_y| - \log|d_z f^n \Lambda u_y|\right|$. For every $p \in V^s, u_p \in T_pV^s(1)$:

$$d_p f^n u_p = d_{f(p)}f^{n-1}d_p f u_p = |d_p f u_p|_\infty \cdot d_{f(p)}f^{n-1}u_{f(p)} = \ldots = \prod_{k=1}^{n}|d_{f^k(p)}f u_{f^k(p)}|_\infty \cdot u_{f^{n+1}(p)}$$

where $u_{f^k(p)} \in T_{f^k(p)}W_k^s(1)$ is defined by the above. Thus:

$$A := \Big|\log\frac{|d_y f^n u_y|_\infty}{|d_z f^n u_z|_\infty}\Big| \le \sum_{k=1}^n \Big|\log|d_{f^k(y)}f u_{f^k(y)}|_\infty - \log|d_{f^k(z)}f u_{f^k(z)}|_\infty\Big|$$

In section 1.2 we have covered M by a finite collection $\mathcal{D}$ of open sets D, equipped with a smooth map $\theta_D : TD \to \mathbb{R}^d$ s.t. $\theta_D|_{T_xM} : T_xM \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is an isometry and $\nu_x := \theta_D^{-1} : \mathbb{R}^d \to TM$ has the property that $(x,v) \mapsto \nu_x(v)$ is Lipschitz on $D \times B_1(0)$. Since f is $C^{1+\beta}-$ and M is compact, $d_p f v$ depends in a β-Hölder way on p, and in a Lipschitz way on v. It follows that there exists a constant $H_0 > 1$ s.t. for every $D \in \mathcal{D}; y,z \in D; u,v \in \mathbb{R}^d(1)$: $\Big|\log|d_y f\nu_y(u)|_\infty - \log|d_z f\nu_z(v)|_\infty\Big| < H_0(d(y,z)^\beta + |u-v|_\infty)$. Choose $D_k \in \mathcal{D}$ s.t. $D_k \ni f^k(y), f^k(z)$. Such sets exist provided ϵ is much smaller than the Lebesgue number of $\mathcal{D}$, because by part 1 $d(f^k(y), f^k(z)) < 4\epsilon$. Writing $Id = \theta_{D_k} \circ \nu_{f^k(y)}$ and $Id = \theta_{D_k} \circ \nu_{f^k(z)}$ we see that:

$$\begin{aligned}
A &\le \sum_{k=1}^n \Big|\log|d_{f^k(y)}f\nu_{f^k(y)}\theta_{D_k}u_y|_\infty - \log|d_{f^k(z)}f\nu_{f^k(z)}\theta_{D_k}u_z|_\infty\Big| \le \\
&\le \sum_{k=1}^n H_0\Big(d(f^k(y),f^k(z))^\beta + |\theta_{D_k}u_{f^k(y)} - \theta_{D_k}y_{f^k(z)}|_\infty\Big) \le \\
&\le \frac{H_0\cdot(4p_0^s)^\beta}{1-e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta\chi}} + H_0\sum_{k=1}^n |\theta_{D_k}u_{f^k(y)} - \theta_{D_k}u_{f^k(z)}|_\infty \ \ \because \text{ part 1.} \qquad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate $N_k := |\theta_{D_k}u_{f^k(y)} - \theta_{D_k}u_{f^k(z)}|_\infty$. By definition $u_{f^k(y)}, u_{f^k(z)} \in Tf^k[V^s] \subset W_k^s$, tangent at $f^k(y)$ and $f^k(z)$ respectively. Defining y_k', z_k' as before, we obtain that for some $\xi_k, \eta_k, |\xi_k|_\infty = |\eta_k|_\infty = 1$:

$$u_{f^k(y)} = \frac{d_{y_k'}\psi_{x_k}\begin{pmatrix}\xi_k\\ d_{y_k}F_k\xi_k\end{pmatrix}}{\Big|d_{y_k'}\psi_{x_k}\begin{pmatrix}\xi_k\\ d_{y_k}F_k\xi_k\end{pmatrix}\Big|_\infty}, u_{f^k(z)} = \frac{d_{z_k'}\psi_{x_k}\begin{pmatrix}\eta_k\\ d_{z_k}F_k\eta_k\end{pmatrix}}{\Big|d_{z_k'}\psi_{x_k}\begin{pmatrix}\eta_k\\ d_{z_k}F_k\eta_k\end{pmatrix}\Big|_\infty}$$

By the definition of ψ_{x_k}, and since $\|d_{y_k}\exp_{x_k}^{-1}\|, \|d_{z_k}\exp_{x_k}^{-1}\| \le 2$,

$$\|d_{y_k}\psi_{x_k}^{-1}\|, \|d_{z_k}\psi_{x_k}^{-1}\| \le 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_k)\|.$$

So the denominators are bounded below by $\frac{1}{2}\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_k)\|^{-1}\Big|\begin{pmatrix}\xi_k/\eta_k\\ d_{y_k}F_k\xi_k/\eta_k\end{pmatrix}\Big|_\infty = \frac{1}{2}\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_k)\|^{-1}$ respectively (recall the notations defined in §0.6, section (4)).

Since for every two non-zero vectors u, v: $\Big|\frac{u}{|u|} - \frac{v}{|v|}\Big| \le \frac{|u-v|}{\max\{|v|,|u|\}}$, we get:

$$N_k \le 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_k)\|\cdot\Big|\theta_{D_k}d_{y_k'}\psi_{x_k}\begin{pmatrix}\xi_k\\ d_{y_k}F_k\xi_k\end{pmatrix} - \theta_{D_k}d_{z_k'}\psi_{x_k}\begin{pmatrix}\eta_k\\ d_{z_k}F_k\eta_k\end{pmatrix}\Big|.$$

On D_k we can write $\psi_{x_k} = exp_{x_k}\circ\nu_{x_k}\circ C_{x_k}$, where $\nu_{x_k}\circ C_{x_k} = C_\chi(x_k)$. Let $w_k := C_\chi(x_k)y_k', t_k := C_\chi(x_k)z_k', r_k := C_{x_k}\begin{pmatrix}\xi_k\\ d_{y_k}F_k\xi_k\end{pmatrix}, s_k := C_{x_k}\begin{pmatrix}\eta_k\\ d_{z_k}F_k\eta_k\end{pmatrix}$, then:

$$N_k \le 2\|\theta_{D_k}d_{w_k}exp_{x_k}\nu_{x_k}(r_k) - \theta_{D_k}d_{t_k}exp_{x_k}\nu_{x_k}(s_k)\|$$

We study this expression. In what follows we identify the differential of a linear map with itself. By construction, the map $(x,\underline{v},\underline{u}) \mapsto [\theta_D\circ d_{\underline{v}}\exp_x][\nu_x(\underline{u})]$ is smooth on $D\times B_2(0)\times B_2(0)$ for every $D \in \mathcal{D}$. Therefore there exists a constant $E_0 > 1$ s.t. for every $(x,\underline{v}_i,\underline{u}_i) \in D\times B_2(0)\times B_2(0)$ and every $D \in \mathcal{D}$:

$$|\theta_D d_{\underline{v}_1}\exp_x\nu_x(\underline{u}_1) - \theta_D d_{\underline{v}_2}\exp_x\nu_x(\underline{u}_2)| \le E_0(|\underline{v}_1-\underline{v}_2|_\infty + |\underline{u}_1-\underline{u}_2|_\infty)$$

It follows that:

$$N_k \le 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_k)\|\cdot E_0(|w_k-t_k|_\infty + |r_k-s_k|_\infty)$$

Since $C_\chi(x_k), C_{x_k}$ are contractions,

$$\begin{aligned}N_k \leq & 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_k)\| \cdot E_0(|y_k' - z_k'|_\infty + \Big|\begin{pmatrix} \xi_k \\ d_{y_k}F_k\xi_k \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \eta_k \\ d_{z_k}F_k\eta_k \end{pmatrix}\Big|_\infty) \\ \leq & 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_k)\| \cdot E_0(2e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}k}p_0^s + C(\chi,\beta)(p_0^s)^{\beta/3}e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}k}) \ (\because \text{part 1, and the claim from the beginning of this part}) \\ \leq & 2E_0(C(\chi,\beta)+2)\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_k)\|(p_0^s)^{\beta/3}e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}k} = 2E_0(C(\chi,\beta)+2)\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_k)\|(p_0^s)^{\beta/12}(p_0^s)^{\beta/4}e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}k}\end{aligned}$$

Since $(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$: $p_i^s = \min\{e^\epsilon p_{i+1}^s, Q_\epsilon(x_i)\} \leq e^\epsilon p_{i+1}^s$, whence $p_0^s \leq e^{k\epsilon}p_k^s$:

$$N_k \leq 2E_0(C(\chi,\beta)+2)\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_k)\|(p_k^s)^{\beta/12}(p_0^s)^{\beta/4}e^{-(\frac{\chi\beta}{6}-\epsilon\beta/12)k} \leq 2E_0(C(\chi,\beta)+2)(p_0^s)^{\beta/4}e^{-(\frac{\chi\beta}{6}+\epsilon\beta/12)k}.$$

Plugging this into Eq. (8) gives:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\log\frac{|d_yf^nu_y|_\infty}{|d_zf^nu_z|_\infty}\Big| \leq & \frac{H_0\cdot(4p_0^s)^\beta}{1-e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta\chi}} + H_0\cdot 2E_0(C(\chi,\beta)+2)\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}e^{-(\frac{\chi\beta}{6}-\epsilon\beta/12)k}(p_0^s)^{\beta/4} \\ = & \frac{H_0\cdot(4p_0^s)^\beta}{1-e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta\chi}} + H_0\frac{2E_0(C(\chi,\beta)+2)e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}+\epsilon\beta/12}}{1-e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}+\epsilon\beta/12}}(p_0^s)^{\beta/4} \\ \leq & \Big(\frac{4^\beta H_0}{1-e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta\chi}} + H_0\frac{2E_0(C(\chi,\beta)+2)e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}+\epsilon\beta/12}}{1-e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}+\epsilon\beta/12}}\Big)\epsilon Q_\epsilon(x_0)^{\beta/4} \\ \leq & \Big(\frac{4^\beta H_0}{1-e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta\chi}} + H_0\frac{2E_0(C(\chi,\beta)+2)e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}+\chi\beta/12}}{1-e^{-\frac{\chi\beta}{6}+\chi\beta/12}}\Big)\epsilon Q_\epsilon(x_0)^{\beta/4}(\because \epsilon<\chi). \qquad (9)\end{aligned}$$

The factor of $Q_\epsilon(x_0)^{\beta/4}$ is less than $\frac{1}{3}$ for ϵ small enough. How small ϵ should be, depends only on M (through E_0), f (through β and H_0) and χ. □

Definition 2.1.5. *Let $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$. Let V^s be an s-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$ which stays in windows with a representing function F. Let G be the representing function of $\mathcal{F}(V^s)$. Notice that by the assumptions for V^s and by the graph transform it follows that $\mathcal{F}(V^s)$ stays in windows as well. Then*

(1) $p := \psi_x(0, G(0))$,
(2) $q := \psi_y(0, F(0))$.

We call these p-points.

Notice: (1) $f^{-1}(q) \in \mathcal{F}(V^s)$ (2) These are very lean notations and in fact $p = p(V^s), q = q(V^s)$- It will be clear from context what admissible manifolds corresponds to p or q (3) One can make analogous definitions for the unstable case.

Recall the definition of $S(\cdot,\cdot)$ from the beginning of theorem 1.1.7.

Lemma 2.1.6. *Let $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$. Let V^s be an s-admissible manifold in $\psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$ which stays in windows. Then $\exists \pi_x : T_p\mathcal{F}(V^s) \to H^s(x), \pi_y : T_qV^s \to H^s(y)$ invertible linear transformations s.t. $\forall \rho \geq e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$: if $\frac{S(q,\lambda)}{S(y,\pi_y\lambda)} \in [\rho^{-1},\rho]$ then*

$$\frac{S(p,\xi)}{S(x,\pi_x\xi)} \in [e^{\frac{1}{6}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}\rho^{-1}, e^{-\frac{1}{6}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}\rho]$$

where $\lambda = d_{f^{-1}(q)}f\Lambda\xi$, $\xi \in T_p\mathcal{F}(V^s)$ arbitrarily and $\Lambda : T_p\mathcal{F}(V^s) \to T_{f^{-1}(q)}\mathcal{F}(V^s)$ is given by prop. 2.1.4. A similar statement holds for the unstable case. We will also see that $\frac{|\pi_x\xi|}{|\xi|} = e^{\pm 2Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}}$ for all $\xi \in T_p\mathcal{F}(V^s)$ (similarly for π_y).

Proof. Denote $\Theta \circ C_\chi(x/f^{-1}(y))$ by $C_{1/2}$ (as the notations defined in §0.6, section (4)), as in proposition 1.2.2. For $\epsilon < \frac{\lambda(\mathcal{D})}{2}$: $p, f^{-1}(y), f^{-1}(q) \in B_{\frac{\lambda(\mathcal{D})}{2}}(x)$ there exists some $D \in \mathcal{D}$ containing all of them; Θ would be its associated isometry.

Let $\xi \in T_p\mathcal{F}(V^s)$, and assume $\xi = d_{(0,G(0))}\psi_x\begin{pmatrix} v \\ d_0Gv \end{pmatrix}$. We define $\pi_x\xi := d_{(0,0)}\psi_x\begin{pmatrix} v \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ (π_y is defined analogously).

$$\frac{S(x,\pi_x\xi)}{S(p,\xi)}=\frac{S(f^{-1}(q),\Lambda\xi)}{S(p,\xi)}\cdot\frac{S(f^{-1}(y),\eta)}{S(f^{-1}(q),\Lambda\xi)}\cdot\frac{S(x,\pi_x\xi)}{S(f^{-1}(y),\eta)},\tag{10}$$

where $\eta:=d_y(f^{-1})\pi_y d_{f^{-1}(q)}f\Lambda\xi\in H^s(f^{-1}(y))$. By the third section of proposition 2.1.4, the first multiplied term takes values in $[e^{-\frac{1}{3}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}},e^{\frac{1}{3}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}}]$. We continue to study the third multiplied term. Denote

$$u_1:=C_\chi^{-1}(x)\xi,u_2:=C_\chi^{-1}(f^{-1}(y))\eta$$

WLOG[2] assume $|\xi|=1$ The third term satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\frac{S(f^{-1}(y),\eta)}{S(x,\pi_x\xi)}-1\Big|=&\Big|\frac{|C_\chi^{-1}(f^{-1}(y))\eta|}{|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\pi_x\xi|}-1\Big|=\Big|\frac{|C_2^{-1}\Theta\eta|}{|C_1^{-1}\Theta\pi_x\xi|}-1\Big|\\ \le&\Big|\frac{|C_2^{-1}\Theta\eta-C_1^{-1}\Theta\eta|+|C_1^{-1}\Theta\eta-C_1^{-1}\Theta\pi_x\xi|+|C_1^{-1}\Theta\pi_x\xi|}{|C_1^{-1}\Theta\pi_x\xi|}-1\Big|\\ \le&\|C_2^{-1}-C_1^{-1}\|\cdot|\eta|+\|C_1^{-1}\|\cdot|\Theta\pi_x\xi-\Theta\eta|\\ \le&2\epsilon\cdot 2M_f^2Q_\epsilon(x)Q_\epsilon(f^{-1}(y))+\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|\cdot|\Theta\pi_x\xi-\Theta\eta|\\ &(\because\text{lemma 1.2.3},|\eta|\le M_f^2\cdot e^{\frac{1}{3}Q_\epsilon(f^{-1}(q))^{\beta/4}}\le 2M_f^2)\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

The last inequality is due to a stronger bound than the bound quoted in lemma 1.2.3, but in fact it follows from the same calculations in it. Recalling that $\frac{Q_\epsilon(f^{-1}(y))}{Q_\epsilon(y)}\le\omega_0$, and substituting, we get:

$$\Big|\frac{S(f^{-1}(y),\eta)}{S(x,\pi_x\xi)}-1\Big|\le\epsilon\cdot 4M_f^2\omega_0Q_\epsilon(x)Q_\epsilon(y)+\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|\cdot|\Theta\pi_x\xi-\Theta\eta|\le\frac{1}{4}Q_\epsilon(x)Q_\epsilon(y)+\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|\cdot|\Theta\pi_x\xi-\Theta\eta|$$

for small enough ϵ. So now to bound $|\Theta\pi_x\xi-\Theta\eta|$:

Step 1: Recall the definition of E_0 from proposition 2.1.4(3). We get

$$\begin{aligned}|\Theta\xi-\Theta\pi_x\xi|=&|\Theta d_{(0,G(0))}\psi_x\begin{pmatrix}v\\d_0Gv\end{pmatrix}-\Theta d_{(0,0)}\psi_x\begin{pmatrix}v\\0\end{pmatrix}|\\ =&|\Theta\Big(d_{C_\chi(x)(0,G(0))}\exp_x\Big)\nu_x\circ C_1\begin{pmatrix}v\\d_0Gv\end{pmatrix}-\Theta\Big(d_{C_\chi(x)(0,0)}\exp_x\Big)\nu_x\circ C_1\begin{pmatrix}v\\0\end{pmatrix}|\\ \le&E_0\Big(\Big|C_1\Big(\begin{pmatrix}v\\d_0Gv\end{pmatrix}-\begin{pmatrix}v\\0\end{pmatrix}\Big)\Big|+\Big|C_\chi(x)\Big((0,G(0))-(0,0)\Big)\Big|\Big)\\ \le&|v|\cdot\|d_0G\|+|G(0)|\le|v|\cdot\|d_0G\|+Q_\epsilon(x)|v|(\because C_1,C_\chi(x)\text{ are contractions})\\ \le&2Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/3}\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|\le Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}(\because|v|\le 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|,\|d_0G\|\le\frac{1}{2}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/3}).\end{aligned}$$

Step 2: $|\Theta\xi-\Theta\Lambda\xi|\le Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}$ by the bound for N_k for ϵ small enough, Eq. (9) in proposition 2.1.4.

Step 3: Let $\tilde\varphi:=\Lambda\xi$, $\varphi:=d_{f^{-1}(q)}f\tilde\varphi$ and $\hat\varphi=\frac{\varphi}{|\varphi|}$ [3] Then

$$\begin{aligned}|\Theta d_y(f^{-1})\pi_y d_{f^{-1}(q)}f\tilde\varphi-\Theta\tilde\varphi|=&|\Theta d_y(f^{-1})\pi_y d_{f^{-1}(q)}f\tilde\varphi-\Theta d_q(f^{-1})d_{f^{-1}(q)}f\tilde\varphi|\\ =&|\Theta d_y(f^{-1})\pi_y\varphi-\Theta d_q(f^{-1})\varphi|=|\Theta d_y(f^{-1})\nu_y\Theta'\pi_y\varphi-\Theta d_q(f^{-1})\nu_q\Theta'\varphi|\\ \le&|\Theta d_y(f^{-1})\nu_y\Theta'\pi_y\varphi-\Theta d_q(f^{-1})\nu_q\Theta'\pi_y\varphi|+|\Theta d_q(f^{-1})\nu_q\Theta'\pi_y\varphi-\Theta d_q(f^{-1})\nu_q\Theta'\varphi|\\ \le&\|\Theta d_y(f^{-1})\nu_y-\Theta d_q(f^{-1})\nu_q\|\cdot|\pi_y\varphi|+M_f|\Theta'\pi_y\varphi-\Theta'\varphi|\\ \le&H_0\cdot d(q,y)^\beta|\pi_y\varphi|+M_f|\Theta'\pi_y\hat\varphi-\Theta'\hat\varphi|\cdot|\varphi|\end{aligned}$$

where Θ' is the linear isometry for the neighborhood containing y and q, as in def. 1.2.1, and H_0 is the bound for Höl$(d.f^{-1})$ as in proposition 2.1.4.

[2]Otherwise cancel its size from both the denominator and numerator of the LHS of the of Eq. (11).

[3]$\hat\varphi$ is well defined since f is a diffeomorphism, Λ is invertible and $|\xi|=1$ (assumed WLOG).

Now, by the definition of Λ (prop. 2.1.4): $|\tilde{\varphi}| \leq e^{\frac{1}{3}Q_\epsilon(f^{-1}(q))^{\beta/4}}|\xi| \leq 2 \cdot 1$, hence $|\varphi| \leq M_f \cdot 2$. By exactly the same calculations as of step 1: $|\Theta' \pi_y \hat{\varphi} - \Theta' \hat{\varphi}| \leq Q_\epsilon(y)^{\beta/4}$, and hence also $|\pi_y \varphi| = |\pi_y \hat{\varphi}| \cdot |\varphi| \leq (1 + Q_\epsilon(y)^{\beta/4}) \cdot 2M_f < 3M_f$. So:

$$|\Theta d_y(f^{-1}) \pi_y d_{f^{-1}(q)} f \tilde{\varphi} - \Theta \tilde{\varphi}| \leq M_f \cdot (H_0 \cdot Q_\epsilon(y)^\beta \cdot 3 + M_f \cdot Q_\epsilon(y)^{\beta/4} \cdot 2) < M_f^2 (3H_0 + 2) Q_\epsilon(y)^{\beta/4}.$$

Since $\psi_x^{p^s, p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s, q^u}$, $\psi_{f(x)}^{p^s \wedge p^u}$ and $\psi_y^{q^s \wedge q^u}$ ϵ-overlap. Hence lemma 1.2.3 gives us the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{Q_\epsilon(y)}{Q_\epsilon(x)} =& \frac{Q_\epsilon(f(x))}{Q_\epsilon(x)} \cdot \frac{Q_\epsilon(y)}{Q_\epsilon(f(y))} \leq \omega_0 \frac{Q_\epsilon(y)}{Q_\epsilon(f(y))} \leq \omega_0 e^{\frac{\epsilon}{3}} \Big(\frac{\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\|}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(f(x))\|} \Big)^{\frac{-48}{\beta}} \\ \leq& \omega_0 e^{\frac{\epsilon}{3}} (e^{Q_\epsilon(f(x)) Q_\epsilon(y)})^{\frac{-48}{\beta}} \leq \omega_0 e^\epsilon \text{ (for small enough } \epsilon).\end{aligned}$$

Using it yields:

$$|\Theta d_y(f^{-1}) \pi_y d_{f^{-1}(q)} f \tilde{\varphi} - \Theta \tilde{\varphi}| \leq (3H_0 + 2) e^\epsilon \omega_0 M_f^2 Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4} \leq 2(3H_0 + 2) \omega_0 M_f^2 Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}.$$

Step 4:

$$\begin{aligned}|\Theta \pi_x \xi - \Theta \eta| \leq& |\Theta \pi_x \xi - \Theta \xi| + |\Theta \xi - \Theta \Lambda \xi| + |\Theta \Lambda \xi - \Theta \eta| \\ \leq& Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4} (1 + 1 + 2(3H_0 + 2) \omega_0 M_f^2) \leq 6(H_0 + 1) \omega_0 M_f^2 Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}\end{aligned}$$

So substituting this result:

$$\Big| \frac{S(f^{-1}(y), \eta)}{S(x, \pi_x \xi)} - 1 \Big| \leq \frac{1}{4} Q_\epsilon(x) Q_\epsilon(y) + \|C_1^{-1}\| \cdot 6(H_0 + 1) \omega_0 M_f^2 Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4} \leq \frac{1}{6} Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}$$

for small enough ϵ. Hence: $\frac{S(f^{-1}(y), \eta)}{S(x, \pi_x \xi)} = e^{\pm \frac{1}{3} Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}$.

We are left to study the second multiplied term of the RHS of Eq. (10).

$$\begin{aligned}S^2(f^{-1}(y), \eta) =& 2 \sum_{m=0}^\infty |d_{f^{-1}(y)} f^m \eta|^2 e^{2\chi m} \\ =& 2 \Big(|\eta|^2 + \sum_{m=1}^\infty |d_y f^{m-1} d_{f^{-1}(y)} f \eta|^2 e^{2\chi m} \Big) = 2|\eta|^2 + e^{2\chi} S^2(y, d_{f^{-1}(y)} f \eta).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, and by the assumption of the lemma (and since $\Lambda \xi = \tilde{\varphi}$):

$$S^2(f^{-1}(q), \Lambda \xi) = 2|\tilde{\varphi}|^2 + e^{2\chi} S^2(q, d_{f^{-1}(q)} f \Lambda \xi) \leq 2|\tilde{\varphi}|^2 + \rho^2 e^{2\chi} S^2(y, \pi_y d_{f^{-1}(q)} f \Lambda \xi).$$

Notice that by the choice of η: $d_{f^{-1}(y)} f \eta = \pi_y d_{f^{-1}(q)} f \Lambda \xi$, so:

$$S^2(f^{-1}(q), \Lambda \xi) \leq 2|\tilde{\varphi}|^2 + \rho^2 e^{2\chi} S^2(y, d_{f^{-1}(y)} f \eta)$$

and so:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{S^2(f^{-1}(q), \Lambda \xi)}{S^2(f^{-1}(y), \eta)} \leq& \frac{2|\tilde{\varphi}|^2 + \rho^2 e^{2\chi} S^2(y, d_{f^{-1}(y)} f \eta)}{2|\eta|^2 + e^{2\chi} S^2(y, d_{f^{-1}(y)} f \eta)} = \frac{2|\tilde{\varphi}|^2 + \rho^2 e^{2\chi} S^2(y, d_{f^{-1}(y)} f \eta)}{2|\eta|^2 + e^{2\chi} S^2(y, d_{f^{-1}(y)} f \eta)} \\ =& \rho^2 - \frac{2(\rho^2 - 1)|\tilde{\varphi}|^2 + 2(|\tilde{\varphi}|^2 - |\eta|^2)}{2|\eta|^2 + e^{2\chi} S^2(y, d_{f^{-1}(y)} f \eta)} = \rho^2 - \frac{2(\rho^2 - 1)|\tilde{\varphi}|^2 + 2(|\tilde{\varphi}|^2 - |\eta|^2)}{S^2(f^{-1}(y), \eta)}. \qquad (12)\end{aligned}$$

Notice that by step 3 in the previous page, and the fact that $\eta = d_y(f^{-1}) \pi_y d_{f^{-1}(q)} f \tilde{\varphi}$: $\frac{|\eta|}{|\tilde{\varphi}|} = e^{\pm 2(3H_0 + 2) \omega_0 M_f^2 Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}}$. Also, step 2 gives us $|\tilde{\varphi}| = e^{\pm Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}}$. Together we get that $|\tilde{\varphi}|, |\eta| = e^{\pm Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/5}}$ (for small enough ϵ). Hence

$\left||\tilde{\varphi}|^2-|\eta|^2\right| \le 2(e^{Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/5}}-1) \le 4Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/5}$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho^2-1 \ge e^{2\sqrt{\epsilon}}-1 \ge 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \Rightarrow \\
&(\rho^2-1)+(|\tilde{\varphi}|^2-|\eta|^2) \ge (\rho^2-1)-4Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/5} = (\rho^2-1)[1-\frac{4Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/5}}{\rho^2-1}] \\
&\qquad \ge (\rho^2-1)[1-\frac{4Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/5}}{2\sqrt{\epsilon}}] \ge (\rho^2-1)[1-\frac{1}{20}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}] \text{ (for small enough } \epsilon) \\
&\qquad \ge (\rho^2-1)e^{-\frac{1}{10}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging it in Eq. (12) yields

$$\frac{S^2(f^{-1}(q),\Lambda\xi)}{S^2(f^{-1}(y),\eta)} \le \rho^2 - \frac{2(\rho^2-1)e^{-\frac{1}{10}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{6}}}}{S^2(f^{-1}(y),\eta)} \le \rho^2 - \frac{2(\rho^2-1)e^{-\frac{1}{10}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{6}}}e^{-\frac{2}{3}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{6}}}}{S^2(x,\pi_x\xi)}.$$

The last inequality is due to the bound on the third multiplied term of Eq. (10) that has been calculated before in this proof. So

$$\frac{S^2(f^{-1}(q),\Lambda\xi)}{S^2(f^{-1}(y),\eta)} \le \rho^2 - \frac{2(\rho^2-1)e^{-\frac{2}{3}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}e^{-\frac{1}{10}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{6}}}}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^2\cdot|\pi_x\xi|^2}.$$

Notice:

$$\left||\pi_x\xi|-|\xi|\right| \le |\Theta\pi_x\xi-\Theta\xi| \le Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4} (\because \text{step 1})$$

And we assumed WLOG $|\xi|=1$, so: $|\pi_x\xi| = e^{\pm 2Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}}$. So:

$$\frac{S^2(f^{-1}(q),\Lambda\xi)}{S^2(f^{-1}(y),\eta)} \le \rho^2 - \frac{2(\rho^2-1)e^{-\frac{2}{3}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}e^{-\frac{1}{10}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^2\cdot e^{4Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/4}}} \le \rho^2\Big(1-\frac{2(1-\frac{1}{\rho^2})e^{-Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^2}\Big).$$

The last transition is true since $4Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}} \le (1-\frac{2}{3}-\frac{1}{10})Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{6}}$ (for ϵ small enough). For $\rho \ge e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$: $1-\frac{1}{\rho^2} \ge 1-e^{-2\sqrt{\epsilon}} \ge \sqrt{\epsilon}$, so:

$$\frac{S^2(f^{-1}(q),\Lambda\xi)}{S^2(f^{-1}(y),\eta)} \le \rho^2\Big(1-\frac{2\sqrt{\epsilon}e^{-Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^2}\Big) \le \rho^2\Big(1-\frac{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^2}\Big).$$

Recall $Q_\epsilon(x) < \frac{1}{3^{6/\beta}}(\frac{\epsilon^{90}}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^{48}})^{\frac{1}{\beta}} < \frac{1}{3^{6/\beta}}(\frac{\epsilon^3}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^{12}})^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \le \frac{1}{3^{6/\beta}}(\frac{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^2})^{6/\beta}$. Hence

$$\frac{S^2(f^{-1}(q),\Lambda\xi)}{S^2(f^{-1}(y),\eta)} \le \rho^2(1-3Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}) \le \rho^2 e^{-3Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}.$$

The lower bound is computed similarly.

In summary, $\frac{S^2(f^{-1}(q),\Lambda\xi)}{S^2(f^{-1}(y),\eta)}$ is the product of three terms (Eq. (10)). The first term is bounded by $e^{\pm\frac{1}{3}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}}}$, the third term is bounded by $e^{\pm\frac{1}{3}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}}}$ and the second term takes values in $[\rho^{-2}e^{3Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{6}}}, \rho^2 e^{-3Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{6}}}]$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{S^2(f^{-1}(q),\Lambda\xi)}{S^2(f^{-1}(y),\eta)} \le \rho^2 e^{-3Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}+\frac{2}{3}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}} \le \rho^2\Big(e^{-(\frac{3}{2}+\frac{1}{3})Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}\Big)^2 \le \rho^2\Big(e^{-\frac{1}{6}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{6}}}\Big)^2 \text{ and} \\
&\frac{S^2(f^{-1}(q),\Lambda\xi)}{S^2(f^{-1}(y),\eta)} \ge \rho^{-2}\Big(e^{\frac{1}{6}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{6}}}\Big)^2 \text{ for small enough } \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. □

Lemma 2.1.7. *The following holds for any ϵ small enough. For any two regular chains $(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}, (\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s,q_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, if $\pi[(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}] = \pi[(\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s,q_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}] = p$ then $\forall k\in\mathbb{Z}$*

$$\frac{S(x_k,\pi_{x,k}\xi)}{S(y_k,\pi_{y,k}\Lambda_{y,k}\Lambda_{x,k}\xi)} = e^{\pm 4\epsilon^{1/2}}$$

for any $\xi \in T_{p_k}V_k^s$, where in the notations of the previous lemma: p_k, r_k are "p-points" respective to x_k, y_k, and $\pi_{x/y,k}$ are π_x respective to x_k, y_k. As in the notations of proposition 2.1.4 (3):

$$\Lambda_{x,k} : T_{p_k}V_k^s \to T_{f^k(p)}V_k^s, \Lambda_{y,k} : T_{f^k(p)}U_k^s \to T_{r_k}U_k^s$$

where $V_k^s = V^s((v_i)_{i\geq k}), U_k^s = V^s((u_i)_{i\geq k})$. A similar statement holds for the symmetric $U(\cdot,\cdot)$ case.

Remark: Notice that $T_{f^k(p)}V_k^s = T_{f^k(p)}U_k^s$, which makes the composition $\Lambda_{y,k}\Lambda_{x,k}$ well defined. It can be seen by the fact that p is in the image of π, and hence Lyapunov regular; thus $f^k(p)$ is Lyapunov regular as well. So $H^s(f^k(p))$ must coincide with $T_{f^k(p)}V_k^s$ by proposition 2.1.4(2), since any unstable component to a tangent vector would make the vector unstable. The unstable subspaces must coincide for the same argument in reversed time flow. Thus $T_{f^k(p)}V_k^s = H^s(f^k(p)) = T_{f^k(p)}U_k^s$.

Proof. (Compare with proposition 7.3 in [Sar13]) Denote $\vec{v} = (\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s, p_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\vec{u} = (\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s, q_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$. V_k^s and U_k^s are the s-admissible manifolds which stay in windows that fulfil the assumptions of lemma 2.1.6. We claim it's enough to prove that:

$$\forall \xi \in T_{p_k}V_k^s, \eta \in T_{r_k}U_k^s : \frac{S(p_k,\xi)}{S(x_k,\pi_{x,k}\xi)}, \frac{S(r_k,\eta)}{S(y_k,\pi_{y,k}\eta)} = e^{\pm\sqrt{\epsilon}} \text{ resp.}$$

Proving it would be sufficient, since the manifolds V_k^s stay in windows and contain $f^k(p)$, therefore by the third section of proposition 2.1.4:
$\frac{S(p_k,\xi)}{S(f^k(p),\Lambda_{x,k}\xi)} = e^{\pm\frac{1}{3}Q_\epsilon(x_k)^{\beta/4}}$. The same argument applies to U_k^s. So we can make the following decomposition:

$$\frac{S(x_k,\pi_{x,k}\xi)}{S(y_k,\pi_{y,k}\Lambda_{y,k}\Lambda_{x,k}\xi)} = \frac{S(x_k,\pi_{x,k}\xi)}{S(p_k,\xi)} \cdot \frac{S(p_k,\xi)}{S(f^k(p),\Lambda_{x,k}\xi)} \cdot \frac{S(f^k(p),\Lambda_{x,k}\xi)}{S(r_k,\Lambda_{y,k}\Lambda_{x,k}\xi)} \cdot \frac{S(r_k,\Lambda_{y,k}\Lambda_{x,k}\xi)}{S(y_k,\pi_{y,k}\Lambda_{y,k}\Lambda_{x,k}\xi)}.$$

So it's clear why that would be enough. To bound that expression: We are assuming $\vec{v}$ is regular, therefore there exists a relevant double chart v and a sequence $n_k \uparrow \infty$ s.t. $v_{n_k} = v$ for all k. Write $v = \psi_x^{p^s, p^u}$.

Claim 1:

$$\exists \rho \geq e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \text{ s.t. } \frac{S(p_{n_k},\xi)}{S(x_{n_k},\pi_{x,n_k}\xi)} \in [\rho^{-1},\rho] \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}, \xi \in T_{p_{n_k}}V_{n_k}^s(1)$$

Proof: By assumption $\vec{v}$ is relevant. Choose a chain $\vec{w}$ s.t. $w_0 = v$ and $z := \pi(\vec{w}) \in NUH_\chi$. $W^s := V^s((w_i)_{i\geq 0})$, denote the "$p$ point" (in the notations lemma 2.1.6) of this manifold with p_w. Denote $\Lambda_{p_w,z} : T_{p_w}W^s \to T_zW^s$, as in proposition 2.1.4. We know $\max_\eta \frac{S(p_w,\eta)}{S(z,\Lambda_{p_w,z}\eta)} \leq e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$ by proposition 2.1.4- it is indeed a maximum and not merely a supremum since $S(p_w,\cdot)$ and $S(z,\Lambda_{p_w,z}(\cdot))$ are continuous as shown in theorem 1.1.7 (and $\Lambda_{p_w,z}$ is continuous as a linear map), and it is enough to take the supremum over the compact set $\eta \in H^s(p_w)(1)$, since we can cancel the size of η from the numerator and denominator of $\frac{S(p_w,\eta)}{S(z,\Lambda_{p_w,z}\eta)}$. $\max_{|\eta|=1} S(z,\Lambda_{p_w,z}\eta) < \infty$ since $z \in NUH_\chi(f)$, hence also $\max_{|\eta|=1} S(p_w,\eta) < \infty$. So the following quantity is finite and well defined:

$$\rho_0 := \max\{\max_\eta \frac{S(p_w,\eta)}{S(x,\pi_x\eta)}, \max_\eta \frac{S(x,\pi_x\eta)}{S(p_w,\eta)}, e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\}$$

W^s is an admissible manifold in v_{n_k}. So by taking W^s in $V_{n_{k+l}}$ and applying to it $\mathcal{F}_s$ $n_{k+l} - n_k$ times then the resulting manifolds $W_l^s := \mathcal{F}_s^{n_{k+l}-n_k}(W^s)$ are s-admissible manifolds in v_{n_k} which converge to $V_{n_k}^s$ in C^1 (prop. 1.3.20, proof of item 2). As shown in lemma 2.1.6, the ratio of said S parameters can only improve, so: $\min_\eta / \max_\eta \frac{S(t_l,\eta)}{S(x,\pi_x^{(l)}\eta)} \in [\rho_0^{-1},\rho_0]$ (where t_l is the "p" point of W_l^s, and $\pi_x^{(l)}$ is the respective "π_x" linear transformation). The convergence of W_l^s to $V_{n_k}^s$ means that if W_l^s is represented in v_{n_k} by F_l, and $V_{n_k}^s$ is represented by F, then $\|F_l - F\|_\infty \to 0$. Also, since $\|d.F_l\|_{\beta/3}$ are uniformly bounded away from infinity: $\|d.F_l - d.F\|_\infty \to 0$. So if $t = \psi_x((0,F(0))), t_l = \psi_x((0,F_l(0)))$, then $t_l \to t$ and

$$\sup_u |d_{(0,F(0))}\psi_x((u,d_0Fu)) - d_{(0,F_l(0))}\psi_x((u,d_0F_lu))| \to 0$$

$$\forall \xi \in T_tV_{n_k}^s \exists u \text{ s.t } \xi = d_{(0,F(0))}\psi_x((u,d_0Fu))$$
$$T_{t_l}W_l^s \ni \xi_l := d_{(0,F_l(0))}\psi_x((u,d_0F_lu))$$

$\Rightarrow \xi_l \to \xi$ (in the metric of TM) , and similarly: $\pi_x^{(l)}\xi_l \to \pi_x\xi$ (in regular metric of T_xM)

Fix some N large, $\delta > 0$ small. Since df is continuous, $\exists l$ s.t.

$$\sqrt{2}\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{N} e^{2j\chi}|d_t f^j \xi|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq e^{\delta}\sqrt{2}\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{N} e^{2j\chi}|d_{t_l} f^j \xi_l|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The RHS is $\leq e^{\delta} S(t_l, \xi_l) \leq e^{\delta} S(x, \pi_x^{(l)}\xi_l)\rho_0$ (as mentioned above, due to lemma 2.1.6 and the choice of ρ_0). In theorem 1.1.7 we have seen that $S(x,\cdot)$ is continuous, so: $\lim_{l\to\infty} e^{\delta} S(x, \pi_x^{(l)}\xi_l)\rho_0 = e^{\delta} S(x, \pi_x\xi)\rho_0$ (this is true since the norm of $\xi_l, \pi_x^{(l)}$ are bounded uniformly). Since the inequality would be true for any $l' \geq l$: LHS$\leq e^{\delta} S(x,\xi)\rho_0$, and since that's true for any δ, N:

$$\frac{S(t,\xi)}{S(x,\pi_x\xi)} \leq \rho_0.$$

Recalling $x_{n_k} = x$ and that $S(t,\xi) \geq \sqrt{2}|\xi|\ \forall \xi \neq 0$, we can assume WLOG $|\xi| = 1$, otherwise we cancel its size in the numerator and the denominator of the fraction:

$$\frac{S(t,\xi)}{S(x_{n_k}, \pi_{x,n_k}\xi)} \in [\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\max_{|\xi=1|} S(x, \pi_{x,n_k}\xi)}, \rho_0].$$

Since we have seen in the previous lemma that $\frac{|\pi_x \xi|}{|\xi|} \leq e^{2Q_\epsilon(x_k)^{\beta/4}} \leq e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$, and π_x maps are invertible:

$$\frac{S(t,\xi)}{S(x_{n_k}, \pi_{x,n_k}\xi)} \in [\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\max_{|\eta=1|} e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}} S(x,\eta)}, \rho_0]$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\max_{|\eta=1|} e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}} S(x,\eta)} \leq \min_{\xi} \frac{S(t,\xi)}{S(x_{n_k}, \pi_{x,n_k}\xi)} \leq \max_{\xi} \frac{S(t,\xi)}{S(x_{n_k}, \pi_{x,n_k}\xi)} \leq \rho_0.$$

Hence, the claim would work with $\rho := \rho_0 \cdot e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \max_{|\eta=1|} S(x,\eta)$. This concludes claim 1.

Claim 2:

$$\forall \xi \in T_{p_0} V_0^s(1) : \frac{S(p_0,\xi)}{S(x_0, \pi_{x,0}\xi)} = e^{\pm\sqrt{\epsilon}}$$

Proof: Fix k large. By claim 1, $\forall \xi \in T_{p_{n_k}} V_{n_k}^s(1) : \frac{S(p_{n_k},\xi)}{S(x_{n_k}, \pi_{x,n_k}\xi)} \in [\rho^{-1}, \rho]$. By prop. 1.3.16 $\mathcal{F}_s(V_{n_k}^s) = V_{n_k-1}^s$; and thus by lemma 2.1.6: the bounds for $\frac{S(p_{n_k},\xi)}{S(x_{n_k}, \pi_{x,n_k}\xi)}$ for arbitrary $\xi \in T_{p_{n_k}} V_{n_k}^s(1)$ improve. We ignore those improvements, and write $\frac{S(p_{n_k-1},\xi)}{S(x_{n_k}, \pi_{x,n_k-1}\xi)} \in [\rho^{-1}, \rho]$. Since $x_{n_k} = x$, the next application of $\mathcal{F}_s$ improves the ratio bound by at least $e^{\frac{1}{6}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}$:

$$\frac{S(p_{n_{k-1}},\xi)}{S(x_{n_{k-1}}, \pi_{x,n_{k-1}}\xi)} \in [e^{\frac{1}{6}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}\rho^{-1}, e^{-\frac{1}{6}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}\rho], \forall \xi \in T_{p_{n_k}} V_{n_k}^s(1).$$

We repeat the procedure by applying $\mathcal{F}_s$ $n_{k-1} - n_{k-2} + 1$ times, whilst ignoring the potential improvements of the error bounds, and then $\mathcal{F}_s$ once more and arriving at

$$\frac{S(p_{n_{k-2}},\xi)}{S(x_{n_{k-2}}, \pi_{x,n_{k-2}}\xi)} \in [e^{2\frac{1}{6}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}\rho^{-1}, e^{-2\frac{1}{6}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}}\rho], \forall \xi \in T_{p_{n_k}} V_{n_k}^s(1).$$

We are free to choose k as large as we want. If we choose it large enough for the inequality $e^{k\frac{1}{6}Q_\epsilon(x)^{\beta/6}} > \rho e^{-\sqrt{\epsilon}}$ to hold, then eventually we will reach a time n_{k_0} when the ratio bound is smaller than or equal to $e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$:

$$\frac{S(p_{n_{k_0}},\xi)}{S(x_{n_{k_0}}, \pi_{x,n_{k_0}}\xi)} \in [e^{-\sqrt{\epsilon}}, e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}], \forall \xi \in T_{p_{n_k}} V_{n_k}^s(1).$$

This is the threshold of applicability of the previous lemma. Henceforth we cannot claim that the ratio bound improves. On the other hand it is guaranteed that the ratio bound does not deteriorate. Therefore, after additional n_{k_0} iterations, we obtain $\frac{S(p_0,\xi)}{S(x_0,\pi_{x,0}\xi)} = e^{\pm\sqrt{\epsilon}}, \forall \xi \in T_{p_{n_k}} V_{n_k}^s(1)$.

This concludes claim 2. The same can be concluded for any other term in the chart sequence. □

In order to be able to conclude from $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} \to \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$ that $C_\chi^{-1}(x)$ is similar to $C_\chi^{-1}(y)$ (roughly speaking; similarity has not yet been defined rigorously), we need to show that it means that $C_\chi^{-1}(x), C_\chi^{-1}(y)$ act similarly on the respective stable subspaces.

In the two dimensional case, mapping isometrically (in our case- arbitrarily close to an isometry) the stable subspace of some hyperbolic point to the stable subspace of some other hyperbolic point, is merely choosing a sign from $\{\pm 1\}$, since the subspaces are one-dimensional. Hence comparing the actions of different Lyapunov change of coordinates is straightforward. In the multidimensional case, it takes more than choosing a sign- you can choose any orthogonal map of the space to itself. Orthogonal maps do not necessarily commute. Thus, choosing the linear mapping can affect the way the Lyapunov change of coordinates acts.

We construct a mapping between the stable subspaces which keeps the action of the Lyapunov change of coordinates similar, and allows the comparison.

Claim 2.1.8. *Under the assumptions of the previous lemma:*

$$\exists \Xi_i : T_{x_i}M \to T_{y_i}M \ s.t. \ \forall \xi \in T_{x_i}M(1) : \frac{|C_\chi^{-1}(x_i)\xi|}{|C_\chi^{-1}(y_i)\Xi_i\xi|} = e^{\pm 4\sqrt{\epsilon}},$$

where Ξ_i is an invertible linear transformation, and $\|\Xi_i\| \leq \exp(\epsilon)$.

Proof. Define Ξ_k the following way on the stable/unstable spaces:

$$\Xi_k := \pi_{y,k}\Lambda_{y,k}\Lambda_{x,k}\pi_{x,k}^{-1} : T_{x_k}M \to T_{y_k}M$$

where $\pi_{x/y,k}$ and $\Lambda_{x/y,k}$ are defined as in lemma 2.1.7. The composition of $\Lambda_{y,k}\Lambda_{x,k}$ is well defined by the remark after lemma 2.1.7. The properties of the composing elements of Ξ_k imply that it preserves the stable and unstable subspaces. Ξ_k extends linearly to the whole tangent space of x_k from the definition on the stable and unstable subspaces, using the requirement of being linear. Hence, from definition, and lemma 2.1.7:

$$\frac{|C_\chi^{-1}(x_k)\xi|}{|C_\chi^{-1}(y_k)\Xi_k\xi|} = \sqrt{\frac{S^2(x_k,\xi_s)+U^2(x_k,\xi_u)}{S^2(y_k,\Xi_k\xi_s)+U^2(y_k,\Xi_k\xi_u)}} = e^{\pm 4\sqrt{\epsilon}} \tag{13}$$

where $\xi = \xi_s + \xi_u$, $\xi_{s/u} \in H^{s/u}(x_k)$. We begin by showing bounds on norms of Ξ_k, Ξ_k^{-1} when restricted to the stable/unstable subspaces. By the bounds for the restricted $\|\pi_x\|, \|\pi_x^{-1}\|; \|\Lambda\|, \|\Lambda^{-1}\|$ from lemma 2.1.6 and prop. 2.1.4 resp.,

$$\|\Xi_k\|, \|\Xi_k^{-1}\| \leq \exp\left(2Q_\epsilon(x_k)^{\beta/4} + 2Q_\epsilon(y_k)^{\beta/4} + \frac{1}{3}Q_\epsilon(x_k)^{\beta/4} + \frac{1}{3}Q_\epsilon(y_k)^{\beta/4}\right) \leq \exp(5(Q_\epsilon(x_k)^{\frac{\beta}{4}} + Q_\epsilon(y_k)^{\frac{\beta}{4}})) \tag{14}$$

Now to bound these norms on the whole tangent space: To ease notations we will omit the 'k' subscripts. In what is to come, / is as in the notations of §0.6, section 4: $d(x/y, f^k(p)) < Q_\epsilon(x/y) < \epsilon < \rho$ (by the definition of $Q_\epsilon(\cdot)$ in def. 1.1.12). Hence, the following is well defined: $\psi_x^{-1}(f^k(p)) =: z'_x$, $\psi_y^{-1}(f^k(p)) =: z'_y$. The vectors of the first s coordinates of $z'_{x/y}$ will be called $z_{x/y}$ respectively (the same notations as before).

Part 1: Let $\xi \in T_xM$, $\xi = \xi_s + \xi_u$, $\xi_{s/u} \in H^{s/u}(x)$- then $|\xi_{s/u}| \leq \|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\| \cdot |\xi|$.

Proof: WLOG $|\xi| = 1$. We wish to give a bound to the size of $\xi_{s/u}$ that can be very big, even when $|\xi_s + \xi_u| = |\xi| = 1$. This can happen when the angle between the stable and unstable spaces $\left(\sphericalangle(H^s(x), H^u(x)) = \inf_{\eta_s \in H^s(x), \eta_u \in H^u(x)} |\sphericalangle(\eta_s, \eta_u)|\right)$ is very small, and ξ_s and ξ_u are almost parallel, of the same size, and are pointing to almost opposite directions. Thus their sum cancels each other almost completely and leaves a small remainder vector. They can be very big, while their sum is of size 1.

Consider the triangle created by the tips of ξ_s and $-\xi_u$, and the origin. Denote its angle at the origin by α (the angle between ξ_s and $-\xi_u$). By the fact that the size of the edge in front of α is 1 (since $|\xi_s - (-\xi_u)| = |\xi_s + \xi_u| = 1$), plugged in the Sine theorem, and the fact that $|\xi_u| = |-\xi_u|$, we get that

$$|\xi_s|, |\xi_u| \leq \frac{1}{\sin\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{\inf_{\eta_s \in H^s(x), \eta_u \in H^u(x)} \sin\sphericalangle(\eta_s, \eta_u)} = \frac{1}{\sphericalangle(H^s(x), H^u(x))}.$$

Notice that $\frac{1}{\sin\sphericalangle(\eta_s,\eta_u)} \le \|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|$, $\forall \eta_{s/u} \in H^{s/u}(x)$, which can be seen using the following equality:

$$\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^2 = \sup_{\eta_s\in H^s(x),\eta_u\in H^u(x),|\eta_s+\eta_u|=1} \{S^2(x,\eta_s)+U^2(x,\eta_u)\}.$$

We use the equality by choosing $\eta_s \in H^s(x)(1), \eta_u \in H^u(x)(1)$ which minimize $\sin\sphericalangle(\eta_s,\eta_u)$, and WLOG $\cos\sphericalangle(\eta_s,\eta_u) > 0$. Let $\zeta := \frac{\eta_s-\eta_u}{|\eta_s-\eta_u|}$, so by the facts that $C_\chi^{-1}(x)\eta_s \perp C_\chi^{-1}(x)\eta_u$ and $\|C_\chi(x)\| \le 1$,

$$|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\zeta|^2 \ge \frac{|\eta_s|^2}{|\eta_s-\eta_u|^2} + \frac{|\eta_u|^2}{|\eta_s-\eta_u|^2} = \frac{2}{2-2\cos\sphericalangle(\eta_s,\eta_u))} \ge \frac{1}{1-\cos^2\sphericalangle(\eta_s,\eta_u)} = \frac{1}{\sin^2\sphericalangle(\eta_s,\eta_u)}.$$

This shows the wished inequality. Thus in total, $|\xi_s|, |\xi_u| \le \|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|$.

Part 2: $\Xi = d_{C_\chi(x)z'_x}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) + E_1$, where E_1 is linear and $\|E_1\| \le Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{5}} + Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{5}}$.

Proof: We will begin by showing that the expression above is well defined for $\epsilon < \frac{\rho}{2}$. This is because $\exp_x[B_\epsilon(0)] \subset B_{\epsilon+d(x,y)}(y) \subset B_{2\epsilon}(y)$; $|C_\chi(x)z'_x| = d(x,f^k(p)) < \epsilon$; so $\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x$ is defined on an open neighborhood of $C_\chi(x)z'_x$, and hence is differentiable on it.

By the definition of Ξ, on each stable/unstable subspace it acts as a composition of two linear maps:

- At first $\xi \in H^s(x)$ (WLOG) is mapped to ξ' a tangent vector at $f^k(p)$. By the definition of the components of Ξ: $\xi' = d_{z'_x}\psi_x\begin{pmatrix} v \\ d_{z_x}Gv \end{pmatrix}$, where G is representing the appropriate stable manifold, and $v = C_\chi^{-1}(x)\xi$. ξ' has the following expansion (we write $d_{z'_y}\psi_y^{-1}$, without specifying the meaning is $(d_{z'_y}\psi_y)^{-1}$):

$$\xi' = d_{z'_x}\psi_x\begin{pmatrix} v \\ d_{z_x}Gv \end{pmatrix} = (d_{z'_y}\psi_y)(d_{z'_y}\psi_y^{-1})d_{z'_x}\psi_x\begin{pmatrix} v \\ d_{z_x}Gv \end{pmatrix} =: d_{z'_y}\psi_y\begin{pmatrix} w \\ d_{z_y}Fw \end{pmatrix}$$

  The last equality is due to the fact that we know ξ' is tangent to the stable manifold in $\psi_{y_k}^{q_k^s,q_k^u}$ as well, at $f^k(p)$; where F is the appropriate representing function.
- The second step in the action of Ξ is:

$$\Xi\xi = d_0\psi_y\begin{pmatrix} w \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We get the equality:

$$\begin{pmatrix} w \\ d_{z_y}Fw \end{pmatrix} = (d_{z'_y}\psi_y^{-1})(d_{z'_x}\psi_x)\begin{pmatrix} v \\ d_{z_x}Gv \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence (where w and v are referred to as d-dimensional vectors by recalling that their subspaces are in $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e. $w \sim \begin{pmatrix} w \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, v \sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}$),

$$w = d_{z'_y}\psi_y^{-1}d_{z'_x}\psi_x v + \left[d_{z'_y}\psi_y^{-1}d_{z'_x}\psi_x\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ d_{z_x}Gv \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ d_{z_y}Fw \end{pmatrix}\right]$$

Call the right summand on the RHS $E_s\xi$:

- $\Xi\xi = d_0\psi_y\begin{pmatrix} w \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow |w| = |(d_0\psi_y)^{-1}\Xi\xi| = |C_\chi^{-1}(y)\Xi\xi| \le \|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\| \cdot \|\Xi\Big|_{H^s(x)}\| \cdot |\xi| \le$

  $\le \|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\| \cdot e^{5(Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}}+Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{4}})}|\xi| \le 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\| \cdot |\xi|$ (∵ Eq. (14)).
- $\mathrm{Lip}(G) \le Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{3}}, \mathrm{Lip}(F) \le Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{3}}$ (by the remark after definition 1.3.10)
- $\xi = C_\chi(x)v \Rightarrow |v| \le \|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\| \cdot |\xi|$

Hence:

$$|C_\chi(y)E_s\xi| \le \|d_{z'_x}\psi_x\| \cdot \|d_{z_x}G\| \cdot |v| + \|d_{z_y}F\| \cdot |w| \le 2Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{3}} \cdot \|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\| \cdot |\xi| + Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{3}} \cdot 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\| \cdot |\xi| \le$$

$$\le (Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}} + Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{4}})|\xi|.$$

A similar calculation can be done for $\xi \in H^u(x)$, with a respective E_u.

For a general tangent $\xi \in T_xM$: let $w_{s/u}$ be the first $s(x)$/last $u(x)$ coordinates of $C_\chi^{-1}\xi$; hence

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi\xi =&\Xi(\xi_s+\xi_u) = \Xi d_0\psi_x\begin{pmatrix} w_s \\ w_u\end{pmatrix} = \Xi d_0\psi_x\begin{pmatrix} w_s \\ 0\end{pmatrix} + \Xi d_0\psi_x\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ w_u\end{pmatrix}\\ =&(d_0\psi_y)(d_{z'_y}\psi_y^{-1})(d_{z'_x}\psi_x)\begin{pmatrix} w_s \\ 0\end{pmatrix} + (d_0\psi_y)(d_{z'_y}\psi_y^{-1})(d_{z'_x}\psi_x)\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ w_u\end{pmatrix} + d_0\psi_y(E_s\xi_s+E_u\xi_u)\\ =&(d_0\psi_y)(d_{z'_y}\psi_y^{-1})(d_{z'_x}\psi_x)\begin{pmatrix} w_s \\ w_u\end{pmatrix} + d_0\psi_y(E_s\xi_s+E_u\xi_u) = (d_0\psi_y)(d_{z'_y}\psi_y^{-1})(d_{z'_x}\psi_x)(d_0\psi_x^{-1})\xi + d_0\psi_y(E_s+E_u)\end{aligned}$$

and we will get (since $d_0\psi_x = C_\chi(x), d_0\psi_y^{-1} = C_\chi^{-1}(y), d_{z'_{x/y}}\psi_{x/y} = d_{C_\chi(x/y)z_{x/y'}}\exp_{x/y}\circ C_\chi(x/y)$):

$$\Xi\xi = d_{C_\chi(y)z'_y}\exp_y^{-1} d_{C_\chi(x)z'_x}\exp_x\xi + C_\chi(y)(E_s\xi_s+E_u\xi_u) \equiv d_{C_\chi(x)z'_x}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x)\xi + E_1\xi$$

where

$$\|E_1\xi\| \le \|E_s\|\cdot|\xi_s| + \|E_u\|\cdot|\xi_u| \le (Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}} + Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{4}})(\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|\cdot|\xi| + \|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|\cdot|\xi|) \ (\because \text{Part 1}) \le$$

$$\le 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|(Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}} + Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{4}})|\xi|.$$

Hence

$$\Xi = d_{C_\chi(x)z'_x}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) + E_1 \Rightarrow \|\Xi\| \le \|d.\exp_y^{-1}\|\cdot\|d.\exp_x\| + \|E_1\| \le 4 + 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|(Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}} + Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{4}})$$

Now using this again in Eq. (13):

$$\begin{aligned}\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\| \le& e^{4\sqrt{\epsilon}}\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\Xi\| \le e^{4\sqrt{\epsilon}}\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\|\cdot\|\Xi\| \le e^{4\sqrt{\epsilon}}\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\|\Big(4 + 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|(Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}} + Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{4}})\Big)\\ =&\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\|\cdot e^{4\sqrt{\epsilon}}\Big(4 + 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}}\Big) + \|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|\cdot 2e^{4\sqrt{\epsilon}}\Big(\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\|Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{4}}\Big)\\ \le& 5(1-\epsilon)\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\| + \epsilon\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\| \Rightarrow (1-\epsilon)\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\| \le (1-\epsilon)5\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\| \Rightarrow \|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\| \le 5\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\|.\end{aligned}$$

By symmetry we will also get $\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\| \le 5\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|$. Substituting these in the bounds for $\|E_1\|$:

$$\|E_1\| \le 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}} + 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{4}} \le 2\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|2Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{4}} + 2\cdot 5\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\|Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{4}} \le$$

$$\le Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{5}} + Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{5}} \le \frac{1}{2}\epsilon.$$

QED

Part 3: $\forall u \in R_\epsilon(0)$: $\|\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)u}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) - \Theta_D\| \le \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$ for some appropriate isometry Θ_D to be defined, where $D \in \mathcal{D}$ as in definition 1.2.1.

Proof: Begin by choosing ϵ smaller than $\frac{\lambda(\mathcal{D})}{2\sqrt{d}}$ (as in def. 1.2.1), so we can choose $D \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\exp_x[R_\epsilon(0)] \subset B_{\frac{\lambda(\mathcal{D})}{2}}(x)$; that is due to $d(x,\exp_x C_\chi(x)v) = |C_\chi(x)v|_2 \le \sqrt{d}|v|_\infty < \epsilon\sqrt{d}$, so the set $\exp_x[R_\epsilon(0)]$ has diameter less than $2\sqrt{d}\epsilon < \lambda(\mathcal{D})$. Hence the choice of D (and thusΘ_D) is well defined.

We begin analyzing:

$$\Theta_D\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x = (\Theta_D\exp_y^{-1} - \Theta_D\exp_x^{-1})\exp_x + \Theta_D$$

$\Rightarrow$ for any $u \in R_\epsilon(0)$:

$$\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)u}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) = d_{C_\chi(x)u}(\Theta_D\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) = d_{\exp_x C_\chi(x)u}(\Theta_D\exp_y^{-1} - \Theta_D\exp_x^{-1})d_{C_\chi(x)u}\exp_x + \Theta_D$$

$$\Rightarrow \|\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)u}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) - \Theta_D\| \le \|\Theta_D\exp_y^{-1} - \Theta_D\exp_x^{-1}\|_{C^2}\cdot\|d_{C_\chi(x)u}\exp_x\| \le L_2 d(x,y)\|d_{C_\chi(x)u}\exp_x\|.$$

That's due to the definition of the constant L_2 in prop. 1.2.2 ; and the fact that $d(x,\exp_x C_\chi(x)u) < \sqrt{d}\epsilon \Rightarrow \exp_x C_\chi(x)u \in D$. We also know $\|d_{C_\chi(x)u}\exp_x\| \le \|Id_{T_xM}\| + E_0|C_\chi(x)u - 0| \le 1 + E_0\epsilon$ (E_0 is a constant introduced in proposition 2.1.4), hence in total:

$$\|\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)u}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) - \Theta_D\| \le L_2(1+\epsilon E_0)\cdot d(x,y) < Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{5}} < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon.$$

QED

Hence in total we got

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Xi\| =&\|\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) - \Theta_D + \Theta_D + \Theta_D E_1\| \\ \leq&\|\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) - \Theta_D\| + \|\Theta_D\| + \|E_1\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon + 1 + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon \leq e^\epsilon.\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark: This proof only explicitly specifies the bound for $\|\Xi_i\|$, but from symmetry in the composition of Ξ_i, in fact we get also $\|\Xi_i^{-1}\| \leq e^\epsilon$.

Corollary 2.1.9. *Under the assumptions and notations of the previous lemma:*

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{Z} : \frac{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_i)\|}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(y_i)\|} = e^{\pm 5\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Proof. From the previous claim:

$$\|C_\chi^{-1}(x_i)\| \leq e^{4\sqrt{\epsilon}}\|C_\chi^{-1}(y_i)\Xi_i\| \leq e^{\epsilon+4\sqrt{\epsilon}}\|C_\chi^{-1}(y_i)\| \leq e^{5\sqrt{\epsilon}}\|C_\chi^{-1}(y_i)\|,$$

and by symmetry we get the other inequality, and we are done. □

2.1.2. *Comparing frame parameters.*

Definition 2.1.10. *(See* [Sar13]*)*

(1) A positive or negative chain is called regular if it can be completed to a regular chain (equiv. every coordinate is relevant, and some double chart appears infinitely many times).
(2) If v is a double chart, then $p^{u/s}(v)$ means the $p^{u/s}$ in $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u} = v$
(3) A negative chain $(v_i)_{i\leq 0}$ is called ϵ-maximal if it is regular, and

$$p^u(v_0) \geq e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} p^u(u_0)$$

for every regular chain $(u_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ for which there is a positive regular chain $(v_i)_{i\geq 0}$ s.t. $\pi((u_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}) = \pi((v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})$.
(4) A positive chain $(v_i)_{i\geq 0}$ is called ϵ-maximal if it is regular, and

$$p^s(v_0) \geq e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} p^s(u_0)$$

for every regular chain $(u_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ for which there is a negative regular chain $(v_i)_{i\leq 0}$ s.t. $\pi((u_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}) = \pi((v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})$.

Proposition 2.1.11. *The following holds for all ϵ small enough: for every regular chain $(v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$: $(u_i)_{i\leq 0}$,$(u_i)_{i\geq 0}$ are ϵ-maximal.*

Proof. Step 1: The following holds for all ϵ small enough: Let u and v be two regular chains s.t. $\pi(u) = \pi(v)$. If $u_0 = \psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$ and $v_0 = \psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$, then $\frac{Q_\epsilon(x)}{Q_\epsilon(y)} = e^{\pm\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}$.

Proof: Recall:

$$\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^{48} = \tilde{Q}_\epsilon(x)^{-\beta} \cdot \epsilon^{90}\frac{1}{3^{6/\beta}}, Q_\epsilon(x) \leq \tilde{Q}_\epsilon(x) \leq Q_\epsilon(x) \cdot e^{\frac{1}{3}\epsilon}.$$

So in total $\frac{Q_\epsilon(x)}{Q_\epsilon(y)} \leq e^{\frac{1}{3}\epsilon}\frac{\|C_\chi^{-1}(x)\|^{48}}{\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\|^{48}}$ and by the previous corollary this is less than $e^{\frac{1}{3}\epsilon}e^{240\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ and for ϵ small enough this less than $e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}$. The other inequality is identical.

From here onward, the proof is exactly as in [Sar13], prop. 8.3. The decomposition into steps of both of the proofs is similar.

□

Proposition 2.1.12. *Let $(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^u,p_i^s})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, and $(\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^u,q_i^s})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be two regular chains s.t. $\pi((\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^u,p_i^s})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}) = \pi((\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^u,q_i^s})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})$ then $\frac{p_i^u}{q_i^u}, \frac{p_i^s}{q_i^s} \in [e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}, e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}]$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. By the previous proposition, $(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^u,p_i^s})_{i\leq 0}$ is ϵ-maximal, so $p_0^u \geq e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} q_0^u$. $(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^u,p_i^s})_{i\leq 0}$ is also ϵ-maximal, so $q_0^u \geq e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} p_0^u$. It follows that $\frac{p_0^u}{q_0^u} \in [e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}, e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}]$. Similarly $\frac{p_0^s}{q_0^s} \in [e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}, e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}]$. Working with the shifted sequences $(\psi_{x_{i+k}}^{p_{i+k}^u,p_{i+k}^s})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, and $(\psi_{y_{i+k}}^{q_{i+k}^u,q_{i+k}^s})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, we obtain $\frac{p_i^u}{q_i^u}, \frac{p_i^s}{q_i^s} \in [e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}, e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}]$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

Proposition 2.1.13. *let $(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}, (\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s,q_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be two chains s.t. $\pi((\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}) = \pi((\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s,q_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}) = x$ then $d(x_i, y_i) < 25^{-1}\max\{p_i^s \wedge p_i^u, q_i^s \wedge q_i^u\}$*

Proof. $f^i(x)$ is the intersection of a u-admissible manifold and an s-admissible manifold in $\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u}$, therefore (by prop. 1.3.13) $f^i(x) = \psi_{x_i}(v_i, w_i)$ where $|v_i|_\infty, |w_i|_\infty < 10^{-2}(p_i^s \wedge p_i^u)$. By construction Pesin charts are 2-Lipschitz, therefore $d(f^i(x), x_i) < 50^{-1}(p_i^s \wedge p_i^u)$. Similarly $d(f^i(x), y_i) < 50^{-1}(q_i^s \wedge q_i^u)$. It follows that $d(x_i, y_i) < \frac{1}{25}\max\{q_i^s \wedge q_i^u, p_i^s \wedge p_i^u\}$. □

2.1.3. *Comparing Pesin charts.* The following theorem, the "solution to the inverse problem", is a multidimensional generalization of theorem 5.2 in [Sar13]. Our proof is different from Sarig's: in the higher dimensional case there is no explicit formula for the operator $C_\chi(x)$, because of the lack of a canonical basis compatible with the Lyapunov inner product (see Eq. (1)). To overcome this, we defined the linear transformation Ξ (claim 2.1.8). By proving some of the properties Ξ fulfils, we were able to bypass the specific analysis regarding the matrix terms of $C_\chi(x)$.

Theorem 2.1.14. *The following holds for all ϵ small enough: Suppose $(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}, (\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s,q_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ are regular chains s.t. $\pi((\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}) = p = \pi((\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s,q_i^u})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})$ then for all i:*

(1) $d(x_i, y_i) < \epsilon$

(2) $\frac{p_i^s}{q_i^s}, \frac{p_i^u}{q_i^u} \in [e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}, e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}]$

(3) $(\psi_{y_i}^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_i})(u) = O_i u + a_i + \Delta_i(u)$ *for all $u \in R_\epsilon(0)$, where $O_i \in O(d)$ is a $d \times d$ orthogonal matrix, a_i is a constant vector s.t. $|a_i|_\infty \leq 10^{-1}(q_i^u \wedge q_i^s)$, and Δ_i is a vector field s.t. $\Delta_i(0) = 0, \|d_v\Delta_i\| < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}$.*

Proof. Parts (1) and (2) are the content of proposition 2.1.13 and proposition 2.1.1; hence we are left with proving (3) : First to show that $\psi_{y_i}^{-1}\psi_{x_i}$ is well defined on $R_\epsilon(0)$:

$$\psi_{y_i}^{-1}\psi_{x_i} = C_\chi^{-1}(y_i)\exp_{y_i}^{-1}\exp_{x_i} C_\chi(x_i)$$

By definition 1.1.12 this is well defined and smooth for all v s.t. $d(y_i, \exp_{x_i} C_\chi(x_i)v) < \rho, |C_\chi(x_i)v|_2 < 2r$. So for $v \in R_\epsilon(0)$ and ϵ small enough:

$$|C_\chi(x_i)v|_2 \leq |v|_2 \leq \sqrt{d}|v|_\infty < \epsilon\sqrt{d} < 2r$$

$$\text{and } d(y_i, \exp_{x_i} C_\chi(x_i)v) \leq d(y_i, x_i) + d(x_i, \exp_{x_i} C_\chi(x_i)v) = d(x_i, y_i) + |C_\chi(x_i)v|_2 \leq \epsilon + \sqrt{d}\epsilon.$$

Now we can begin showing 3. We start by pointing out that claim 2.1.8 can be restated as follows:

$$\forall v \in \mathbb{R}^d : |C_\chi^{-1}(y)\Xi C_\chi(x)v| = e^{\pm 4\sqrt{\epsilon}}|C_\chi^{-1}(x)C_\chi(x)v| = |v|e^{\pm 4\sqrt{\epsilon}}$$

By the polar decomposition theorem for real matrices applied to $C_\chi^{-1}(y)\Xi C_\chi(x)$, there exists an orthogonal matrix O, and a positive symmetric matrix R s.t.

$$C_\chi^{-1}(y_i)\Xi_i C_\chi(x_i) = O_i \cdot R_i, \forall v |R_i v| = e^{\pm 4\sqrt{\epsilon}}|v|$$

$$\Big(R_i = \sqrt{(C_\chi^{-1}(y_i)\Xi_i C_\chi(x_i))^t (C_\chi^{-1}(y_i)\Xi_i C_\chi(x_i))}, O_i = C_\chi^{-1}(y_i)\Xi_i C_\chi(x_i) \cdot R_i^{-1}\Big).$$

We now define a transformation Δ_i using the following identity:

$$\psi_{y_i}^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_i} = O_i + \psi_{y_i}^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_i}(0) + \Delta_i.$$

Call $\psi_{y_i}^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_i}(0) =: a_i$. Writing down ψ_{x_i/y_i} explicitly we get:

$$\Delta_i = [C_\chi^{-1}(y_i)\exp_{y_i}^{-1}\exp_{x_i} C_\chi(x_i)] - a_i - O_i$$

We will omit the subscript i for easier notations, so

$$\Delta = C_\chi^{-1}(y)[\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x - \Xi]C_\chi(x) + (C_\chi^{-1}(y)\Xi C_\chi(x) - O) - a.$$

We bound the differentials of all summands separately; beginning with the second one:

$$\|d_{\cdot}(C_\chi^{-1}(y)\Xi C_\chi(x)-O)\| = \|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\Xi C_\chi(x)-O\| = \|OR-O\| = \|R-Id\|.$$

Since R is positive and symmetric, it can be orthogonally diagonalized. Let v_i be the orthonormal basis of eigenvectors, and let λ_i be the eigenvalues. Necessarily $\lambda_i = e^{\pm 4\sqrt{\epsilon}}$. So $|(R-Id)v_i| \le (e^{4\sqrt{\epsilon}}-1)|v_i| \le 8\sqrt{\epsilon}$, so $\|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\Xi C_\chi(x)-O\| = \|R-Id\| \le 8\sqrt{\epsilon}$.

Now to bound the differential of the first summand $(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x - \Xi)$: the following is well defined as explained in Part 3 of claim 2.1.8, and uses z'_x as defined in it.

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x - \Xi) =& \Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) - \Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}\Xi = \Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) - \Theta_D\Xi \\ =& \Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) - \Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)z'_x}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) - \Theta_D E_1.\end{aligned}$$

The last transition is by *Part 2* of claim 2.1.8. Hence, for any $u \in R_\epsilon(0)$:

$$\|\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x - \Xi)\| \le \|\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) - \Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)z'_x}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x)\| + \|E_1\| \le$$

$$\le \|\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x) - \Theta_D\| + \|\Theta_D - \Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)z'_x}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x)\| + \|E_1\|.$$

By explicit calculations in *Part 2* and *Part 3* of claim 2.1.8, and since $|z'_x|_\infty$, we get the following bound:

$$\le Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{5}} + Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{5}} + (Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{5}} + Q_\epsilon(x)^{\frac{\beta}{5}}) \le (3+e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}})Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{5}} \text{ (by step 1 of proposition 2.1.11)} \le 5Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{5}}.$$

Hence, for all $v \in R_\epsilon(0)$, if $C_2 := \Theta_D \circ C_\chi(y)$ then

$$\|d_v\Big(C_\chi^{-1}(y)(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x - \Xi)C_\chi(x)\Big)\| = \|C_2^{-1}\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x - \Xi)C_\chi(x)\| \le$$

$$\le \|C_2^{-1}\| \cdot \|\Theta_D d_{C_\chi(x)v}(\exp_y^{-1}\exp_x - \Xi)\| \le \|C_\chi^{-1}(y)\| 5Q_\epsilon(y)^{\frac{\beta}{5}} \le \sqrt{\epsilon}$$

It is clear that $\|d_{\cdot}a\| = 0$. Hence in total:

$$\|d_v\Delta_i\| \le \sqrt{\epsilon} + 8\sqrt{\epsilon} + 0 \le \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} \text{ , for } \epsilon \text{ small enough and } v \in R_\epsilon(0)$$

It is also clear that $\Delta(0) = 0$ by definition.

$$z'_y = \psi_y^{-1}\psi_x(z'_x) = Oz'_x + \Delta(z'_x) + a$$

Where $\psi_{x_i/y_i}(z'_{x_i/y_i}) = f^i(p)$. We get

$$|a| \le |z'_y| + |z'_x| + |\Delta(z'_x)| \le |z'_y| + |z'_x| + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}|z'_x| \le \frac{1}{10}q^u \wedge q^s$$

□

Corollary 2.1.15. *We can improve part* (3) *in the previous theorem the following way: There is a finite* $\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}$*-dense set* $O_\epsilon(d) \subset O(d)$ *s.t. for any* $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *there is an* $O'_i \in O_\epsilon(d)$*, and* Δ'_i *as before s.t.:*
$(\psi_{y_i}^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_i})(u) = O'_i u + a_i + \Delta'_i(u)$ *for all* $u \in R_\epsilon(0)$*, where* $\Delta'_i(0) = 0, \|d_v\Delta'_i\| < \epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}$

Proof. Choose once and for all of this proof some $\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}$-net for $O(d)$, which exists since $O(d)$ is a compact group. Take some O'_i in it to approximate O_i from the theorem. Define $\Delta'_i := \Delta_i + O_i - O'_i$. The rest follows immediately. □

2.2. **Similar charts have similar manifolds.**

2.2.1. *Comparing manifolds.*

Proposition 2.2.1. *(Compare with* [Sar13]*, prop. 6.4) The following holds for all ϵ small enough: let V^s (resp. U^s) be an s-admissible manifold in $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$ (resp. $\psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$) Suppose V^s, U^s stay in windows. If $x = y$ then either V^s, U^s are disjoint, or one contains the other. The same statement holds for u-admissible manifolds.*

Proof. Assume $V^s \cap U^s \neq \phi$. Since V^s stays in windows there is a positive chain $(\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u})_{i\geq 0}$ such that $\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u} = \psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$ and such that for all $i \geq 0$: $f^i[V^s] \subset W_i^s$ where W_i^s is an s-admissible manifold in $\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s,p_i^u}$.

Claim 1: The following holds for ϵ small enough: $f^n[V^s] \subset \psi_{x_n}[R_{\frac{1}{2}Q_\epsilon(x_n)}(0)]$ for all n large enough.

Proof: Suppose $y \in V^s$, and write as in part 1. of proposition 2.1.4: $f^n(y) = \psi_{x_n}(y'_n)$, where $y'_n = (y_n, F_n(y_n))$, and F_n is the function which represents W_n^s in ψ_{x_n}. We have $y'_{n+1} = f_{x_n x_{n+1}}(y'_n)$ which implies in the notations of the proof of proposition 2.1.4 that if ϵ is small enough then:

$$|y_{n+1}| \leq \|D_{s,n}\| \cdot |y_n| + |h_s^{(k)}(y'_n)| \leq \|D_{s,n}\| \cdot |y_n| + |h_s^{(k)}(0)| + \|d.h_s^{(k)}\|(|y_n| + |F_n(y_n)|) <$$

$$< e^{-\chi}|y_n| + \epsilon\eta_n + 3\epsilon^2(|y_n| + p_n^s) < (e^{-\chi} + 3\epsilon^2)|y_n| + 2\epsilon p_n^s <$$

$$< (e^{-\chi} + 3\epsilon^2)|y_n| + 2\epsilon \min\{e^\epsilon p_{n+1}^s, Q_\epsilon(x_n)\} < (e^{-\chi} + 3\epsilon^2)|y_n| + 2\epsilon e^\epsilon p_{n+1}^s < e^{-\chi/2}|y_n| + 4\epsilon p_{n+1}^s$$

We see that $|y_n| < a_n$ where a_n is defined by induction by

$$a_0 := Q_\epsilon(x_0) \text{ and } a_{n+1} = e^{-\chi/2}a_n + 4\epsilon p_{n+1}^s$$

We claim that if ϵ is small enough then $a_n < \frac{1}{4}p_n^s$ for some n. Otherwise, $p_n^s \leq 4a_n$ for all n, whence $a_{n+1} \leq (e^{-\chi/2} + 16\epsilon)a_n$ for all n, which implies that $a_n \leq (e^{-\chi/2} + 16\epsilon)^n a_0$. But, by assumption $a_n \geq \frac{1}{4}p_n^s \geq \frac{1}{4}(p_n^s \wedge p_n^u) \geq \frac{1}{4}e^{-\epsilon n}(p_0^s \wedge p_0^u)$ (lemma 1.3.4), so necessarily $e^{-\epsilon} \leq e^{-\chi/2} + 16\epsilon$. I f ϵ is small enough this is false and we obtain a contradiction. It follows that $\exists n$ s.t. $a_n < \frac{1}{4}p_n^s$. It is clear from the definition of a_n that if ϵ is small enough then $a_n < \frac{1}{4}p_n^s \Rightarrow a_{n+1} < \frac{1}{4}p_{n+1}^s$, thus $a_n < \frac{1}{4}p_n^s$ for all n large enough. In particular $|y_n| < \frac{1}{4}Q_\epsilon(x_n)$ for all n large enough. Since $y'_n = (y_n, F_n(y_n))$ and $|F_n(y_n)| \leq |F_n(0)| + \mathrm{Lip}(F_n)|y_n| < (10^{-3} + \epsilon)Q_\epsilon(x_n)$: $|y'_n| \leq \frac{1}{2}Q_\epsilon(x_n)$ for all n large enough.

Claim 2: For all ϵ small enough $f^n[U^s] \subset \psi_{x_n}[R_{Q_\epsilon(x_n)}(0)]$ for all n large enough.

Proof: U^s stays in windows so there exists a positive chain $\{\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s,q_i^u}\}_{i\geq 0}$ s.t. $\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s,q_i^u} = \psi_{y_0}^{q_0^s,q_0^u}$, and such that for all $i \geq 0$ $f^i(U^s)$ is a subset of an s-admissible manifold in $\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s,q_i^u}$.

Let z be a point in $U^s \cap V^s$. By part 1 of proposition 2.1.4: for any $w \in U^s$: $d(f^n(w), f^n(z)) \leq 4q_0^s e^{-\frac{1}{2}n\chi}$. Therefore $f^n(z), f^n(w) \in B_{Q_\epsilon(x_n)+4q_0^s}(x_n) \subset B_{5\epsilon}(x_n)$. If $\epsilon < \frac{1}{5}\rho(M)$ then $|\exp_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(z)) - \exp_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(w))| \leq 8e^{-\frac{1}{2}n\chi}q_0^s$. So

$$|\psi_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(z)) - \psi_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(w))| \leq \|C_\chi^{-1}(x_n)\|8e^{-\frac{1}{2}n\chi}q_0^s$$

Since $p_n^s \ll \|C_\chi^{-1}(x_n)\|^{-1}$: $|\psi_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(z)) - \psi_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(w))| \leq 8(p_n^s)^{-1}q_0^s e^{-\frac{1}{2}n\chi}$. Since $\{\psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s,q_i^u}\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a chain: $p_i^s = \min\{e^\epsilon p_{i+1}^s, Q_\epsilon(x_i)\} \leq e^\epsilon p_{i+1}^s$ for all i. It follows that $p_0^s \leq e^{n\epsilon}p_n^s$, whence

$$|\psi_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(z)) - \psi_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(w))| \leq 8(\frac{q_0^s}{p_0^s})e^{-\frac{1}{2}n\chi+n\epsilon} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \text{ exponentially fast}$$

And since $Q_\epsilon(x_n) \geq (p_n^s \wedge p_n^u) \geq e^{-\epsilon n}(p_0^s \wedge p_0^u)$: for all n large enough:

$$|\psi_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(z)) - \psi_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(w))| \leq \frac{1}{2}Q_\epsilon(X_n)$$

How large depends only on (p_0^s, p_0^u) and q_0^s. Since by claim 1 $|\psi_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(z))| \leq \frac{1}{2}Q_\epsilon(x_n)$ for all n large enough, we have that $|\psi_{x_n}^{-1}(f^n(w))| \leq Q_\epsilon(x_n)$ for all n large enough. All estimations are uniform in $w \in U^s$, so the claim is proven.

Claim 3: Recall that V^s is s-admissible in $\psi_x^{p^s,p^u}$ and U^s is s-admissible in $\psi_y^{q^s,q^u}$. If $p^s \leq q^s$ then $V^s \subset U^s$ (and vice versa of course from symmetry).

Proof: WLOG $p^s \leq q^s$. Pick n_0 s.t. for all $n \geq n_0$: $f^n[U^s], f^n[V^s] \subset \psi_{x_n}[R_{Q_\epsilon(x_n)}(0)]$. Then: $f^{n_0}[V^s], f^{n_0}[u^s] \subset W^s := V^s((\psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s, p_i^u})_{i \geq n_0})$ (proposition 1.3.20 section 4.). Let G be the function which represents W^s in $\psi_{x_{n_0}}$, then $\psi_{x_n}^{-1}[f^n[U^s]]$ and $\psi_{x_n}^{-1}[f^n[V^s]]$ are two connected subsets of $graph(G)$. Write

$$f^n[V^s] = \psi_{x_n}[\{(t, G(t)) | t \in S_v \subset \mathbb{R}^s\}], f^n[U^s] = \psi_{x_n}[\{(t, G(t)) | t \in S_u \subset \mathbb{R}^s\}]$$

Since V^s and U^s intersect, also $f^n[V^s]$ and $f^n[U^s]$ intersect. We use the assumption that $p^s \leq q^s$ to show that $S_v \subset S_u$. Otherwise there is a point $z \in \partial S_u$ s.t. z is in the relative interior of S_v. This can be seen by constructing a continuous path included in the interior of S_v connecting some $z' \in S_u \cap S_v$ with some point in $S_v \setminus S_u (\neq \phi$ by assumption); there is such a path since V^s is a connected manifold and S_v is a homeomorph of V_s. z is the intersection of the path γ and ∂S_u. I.e. denote the continuous path by $\gamma : [0,1] \to S_v$, $\gamma(0) = z'$, then $t_0 := \inf\{t \in [0,1] | \gamma(t) \notin S_u\} \Rightarrow z := \gamma(t_0)$.

Then since f is a homeomorphism: $f^{-n}(\psi_{x_n}(z, G(z)))$ is in the relative interior of V^s. Now, since U^s is a closed set, so is S_u; and the fact that $t \mapsto f^{-n}(\psi_{x_n}(t, G(t))) : S_u \to U^s$ is continuous and onto U^s gives us that z being a boundary point of S_u means that $f^{-n}(\psi_{x_n}(z, G(z)))$ must be a boundary point of U^s as well. So we get that U^s has a boundary point in the relative interior of V^s. We now use the assumption that $x = y$ and view V^s and U^s as submanifolds of the chart$\psi_x^{p^s, p^u}$. The boundary points of U^s have s-coordinates with $|\cdot|_\infty$-norm equal to q^s, and the points of V^s have s-coordinates with $|\cdot|_\infty$-norm less or equal to p^s. It follows that $q^s < p^s$, in contradiction to our assumption. It follows that $f^n[V^s] \subset f^n[U^s]$, whence $V^s \subset U^s$. $\square$

3. Markov partitions and symbolic dynamics [Bow78, Bow08, Sar13]

Parts 1 and 2 of this paper developed the shadowing theory needed to construct Markov partitions à la Bowen ([Bow78, Bow08]).

What remains is to carry out this construction. This is the content of this part. We follow [Sar13] closely.

3.1. **A locally finite countable Markov partition.**

3.1.1. *The cover.* In subsection 1.3 we constructed a countable Markov shift Σ with countable alphabet $\mathcal{V}$ and a Hölder continuous map $\pi : \Sigma \to M$ which commutes with the left shift $\sigma : \Sigma \to \Sigma$, so that $\pi[\Sigma]$ has full measure with respect to any χ-hyperbolic measure. Moreover, using the convention that any element of $\mathcal{V}$ is relevant, we get that if:

$$\Sigma^{\#} = \{u \in \Sigma : u \text{ is a regular chain}\} = \{u \in \Sigma : \exists v, w \in \mathcal{V} \exists n_k, m_k \uparrow \infty \text{ s.t. } u_{n_k} = v, u_{-m_k} = w\}$$

then $\pi[\Sigma^{\#}] \supset NUH^{\#}_{\chi}$. Therefore $\pi[\Sigma^{\#}]$ has full probability w.r.t any χ-hyperbolic measure.

In this section we study the following countable cover of $NUH^{\#}_{\chi}$:

Definition 3.1.1. *$\mathcal{Z} := \{Z(v) : v \in \mathcal{V}\}$, where $Z(v) := \{\pi(u) : u \in \Sigma^{\#}, u_0 = v\}$.*

Theorem 3.1.2. *For every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $|\{Z' \in \mathcal{Z} : Z' \cap Z \neq \phi\} < \infty|$.*

Proof. Fix some $Z = Z(\psi_x^{p^s, p^u})$. If $Z' = Z(\psi_y^{q^s, q^u})$ intersects Z then there must exist two chains $v, w \in \Sigma^{\#}$ s.t. $v_0 = \psi_x^{p^s, p^u}, w_0 = \psi_y^{q^s, q^u}$ and $\pi(v) = \pi(w)$. Proposition 2.1.12 says that in this case

$$q^u \geq e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} p^u, q^s \geq e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} p^s.$$

It follows that Z' belongs to

$\{Z(\psi_y^{q^s, q^u}) : \psi_y^{q^s, q^u} \in \mathcal{V}, q^u \wedge q^s \geq e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}(p^u \wedge p^s)\}$. By definition the cardinality of this set is less than or equal to:

$$|\{\psi_y^{\eta} \in \mathcal{A} : \eta \geq e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}(p^s \wedge p^u)\}| \times |\{(q^s, q^u) \in I_\epsilon \times I_\epsilon : q^s \wedge q^u \geq e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}(p^s \wedge p^u)\}|.$$

This is a finite number because of the discreteness of $\mathcal{A}$ (proposition 1.2.5). □

3.1.2. *Product structure.* Suppose $x \in Z(v) \in \mathcal{Z}$, then $\exists u \in \Sigma^{\#}$ s.t. $u_0 = v$ and $\pi(u) = x$. Associated to u are two admissible manifolds in v: $V^s((u_i)_{i \leq 0})$ and $V^u((u_i)_{i \geq 0})$. These manifolds do not depend on the choice of u:

If $w \in \Sigma^{\#}$ is another chain s.t. $w_0 = v$ and $\pi(w) = x$ then

$$V^s((u_i)_{i \leq 0}) = V^s((w_i)_{i \leq 0}) \text{ and } V^u((u_i)_{i \geq 0}) = V^u((w_i)_{i \geq 0}),$$

because of proposition 2.2.1 and the equalities $p^{s/u}(w_0) = p^{s/u}(u_0) = p^{s/u}(v)$. We are therefore free to make the following definition:

Definition 3.1.3. *Suppose $Z = Z(v) \in \mathcal{Z}$. For any $x \in Z$:*

(1) $V^s(x, Z) := V^s((u_i)_{i \leq 0})$ for some $u \in \Sigma^{\#}$ s.t. $u_0 = v$ and $\pi(u) = x$.
$W^s(x, Z) := V^s(x, Z) \cap Z$

(2) $V^u(x, Z) := V^u((u_i)_{i \geq 0})$ for some $u \in \Sigma^{\#}$ s.t. $u_0 = v$ and $\pi(u) = x$.
$W^u(x, Z) := V^u(x, Z) \cap Z$

Proposition 3.1.4. *Suppose $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, then for any $x, y \in Z$: $V^u(x, Z), V^u(y, Z)$ are either equal or they are disjoint. Similarly for $V^s(x, Z), V^s(y, Z)$; and $W^s(x, Z), W^s(y, Z)$ and $W^u(x, Z), W^u(y, Z)$*

Proof. The statement holds for $V^{s/u}(x, Z)$ because of proposition 2.2.1. The statement for $W^{s/u}$ is an immediate corollary. □

Proposition 3.1.5. *Suppose $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, then for any $x, y \in Z$: $V^u(x, Z)$ and $V^s(y, Z)$ intersect at a unique point $z \in Z$. Thus $W^u(x, Z) \cap W^s(y, Z) = \{z\}$.*

Proof. See proposition 10.5 in [Sar13]. □

Definition 3.1.6. *The Smale brackets of two points $x, y \in Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ is the unique point $[x, y]_Z \in W^u(x, Z) \cap W^s(y, Z)$.*

Lemma 3.1.7. *Suppose $x, y \in Z(v_0)$, and $f(x), f(y) \in Z(v_1)$. If $v_0 \to v_1$ then $f([x,y]_{Z(v_0)}) = [f(x), f(y)]_{Z(v_1)}$.*

Proof. See lemma 10.7 in [Sar13].

□

Lemma 3.1.8. *The following holds for all ϵ small enough: Suppose $Z, Z' \in \mathcal{Z}$. If $Z \cap Z' \neq \phi$ then for any $x \in Z, y \in Z'$: $V^s(x, Z)$ and $V^s(y, Z')$ intersect at a unique point.*

We do not claim that this point is in Z nor Z'.

Proof. Suppose $Z = Z(\psi_{x_0}^{p_0^s, p_0^u}), Z' = Z(\psi_{y_0}^{q_0^s, q_0^u})$ intersect. We are asked to show that for every $x \in Z$ and $y \in Z'$: $V^u(x, Z)$ and $V^s(y, Z')$ intersect at a unique point. Fix some $z \in Z \cap Z'$, then there are $v, w \in \Sigma^\#$ s.t. $v_0 = \psi_{x_0}^{p_0^s, p_0^u}, w_0 = \psi_{y_0}^{q_0^s, q_0^u}$ and $z = \pi(v) = \pi(w)$. Write $p := p_0^s \wedge p_0^u$ and $q := q_0^s \wedge q_0^u$. By theorem 2.1.14 $p_0^u/q_0^u, p_0^s/q_0^s, p_0^s \wedge p_0^u/q_0^s \wedge q_0^u \in [e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}, e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}]$ and by corollary 2.1.15:

$$\psi_{x_0}^{-1} \circ \psi_{y_0} = O + a + \Delta \text{ on } R_{\max\{Q_\epsilon(x_0), Q_\epsilon(y_0)\}}(0),$$

where O, a, Δ are as in the notations of corollary 2.1.15. Now suppose $x \in Z$. $V^u = V^u(x, Z)$ is a u-admissible manifold in $\psi_{x_0}^{p_0^s, p_0^u}$, therefore it can be put in the form $V^u(x, Z) = \{(F(t), t) : |t|_\infty < p_0^u\}$, where F is the representative function. We write $V^u(x, Z)$ in ψ_{y_0}-coordinates. Denote the standard orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$ by $\{e_i\}_{i=1,..,d}$, and $\mathbb{R}_{s/u} := \text{span}\{e_i\}_{i=1,..,s(x)} / \text{span}\{e_i\}_{i=s(x)+1,..,d}$. Since O is orthogonal: $O[\mathbb{R}_s] \perp O[\mathbb{R}_u]$ and $\mathbb{R}^d = O[\mathbb{R}_s] \bigoplus O[\mathbb{R}_u]$. Let $a = a_s + a_u$, $a_{s/u} \in O[\mathbb{R}_{s/u}]$ and $\Delta = \Delta_s + \Delta_u$ where $\Delta_{s/u} : \mathbb{R}^d \to O[\mathbb{R}_{s/u}]$, then

$$\begin{aligned} V^u(x, Z) =& \Big(\psi_{y_0} \circ (\psi_{y_0}^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_0})\Big)[\{(F(t), t) : |t|_\infty \leq p_0^u\}] \\ =& \psi_{y_0}[\{O(F(t), t) + a_s + \Delta_s((F(t), t)) + a_u + \Delta_d((F(t), t)) : |t|_\infty \leq p_0^u\}] \\ =& \psi_{y_0}[\{(\tilde{F}(\theta) + a_s + \tilde{\Delta}_s((\tilde{F}(\theta), \theta)) \ , \ \theta + a_u + \tilde{\Delta}_u((\tilde{F}(\theta), \theta))) : |\theta|_\infty \leq p_0^u\}], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the transformation $\theta := O(0, t), \tilde{F}(s) = O(F(O^{-1}s), 0), \tilde{\Delta}(\vec{v}) = \Delta(O^{-1}\vec{v})$; and the norm $|\theta|_\infty$ is calculated w.r.t to the new orthonormal basis after $e_i \mapsto Oe_i$; this is the same basis that gives us the orthogonal decomposition displayed as two components $(\tilde{F}(\theta) + a_s + \tilde{\Delta}_s((\tilde{F}(\theta), \theta)) \ , \ \theta + a_u + \tilde{\Delta}_u((\tilde{F}(\theta), \theta)))$- the first $s(x)$ coordinates, and the rest from the orthogonal complement.

Let $\tau(\theta) := \theta + a_u + \tilde{\Delta}_u((\tilde{F}(\theta), \theta))$. Assuming ϵ is small enough we have:

- $\|d.\tau - Id\| \leq \epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} \Rightarrow \exists (d.\tau)^{-1}$ and $\|(d.\tau)^{-1}\|^{-1}, \|d.\tau\| \leq e^{2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}$; and in particular τ is 1-1.
- $|\tau(0)|_\infty < |a_u|_\infty + |\tilde{\Delta}_u((\tilde{F}(0), 0))|_\infty < 10^{-1}q + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} 10^{-3} p < \frac{1}{6} \min\{p, q\} (\because p \leq e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} q \ , \ q \leq e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} p)$.
- Hence $R' := \tau[R_q(0)] \supset R_{e^{-2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} q}(0) + \tau(0) \supset R_{\frac{2}{3}q}(0)$, and in particular $0 \in R'$.

Since $\tau : R_q(0) \to R'$ is 1-1 (as seen in the first item in the list) and onto, it has a well-defined inverse function $\zeta : R' \to R_q(0)$ which is also onto its target.

Let $G(s) := \tilde{F}(\zeta(s)) + a_s + \tilde{\Delta}_s((\tilde{F}(\zeta(s)), \zeta(s)))$, then

$$V^u(x, Z) = \psi_{y_0}[\{(G(s), s) : s \in R'\}].$$

Here, again, the decomposition into orthogonal components is by $O[\mathbb{R}_s] \perp O[\mathbb{R}_u]$. Using the properties of τ it is not hard to check that

- $\|d.\zeta^{-1}\|^{-1}, \|d.\zeta\| \leq e^{2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}$
- $\text{Rad}_{\|\cdot\|_\infty}(R') := \max_{t \in R'}\{|t|_\infty\} \leq \|d.\tau\| \cdot \text{Rad}_{\|\cdot\|_\infty}(R_q(0)) + |\tau(0)| \leq e^{2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} q + \frac{1}{6}p \leq (1 + \frac{1}{6}) e^{2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} q < 2q$
- $|\zeta(0)|_\infty \leq \|d.\zeta\| \cdot |\tau(0) - 0| + |\zeta(\tau(0))| \leq e^{2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} \frac{1}{6}p + 0 \leq \frac{1}{5}p$
  (this is well defined since $0 \in R_q(0) \Rightarrow \tau(0) \in R'$; and by the third item in the previous list $0 \in R'$)
- Since $|\zeta(0)| \leq \frac{1}{5}p$, $\tilde{F} \circ \zeta$ is well defined on 0, and thus:
  $|\tilde{F} \circ \zeta(0)| \leq |\tilde{F} \circ \zeta(\tau(0))| + \|d.(\tilde{F} \circ \zeta)\| \cdot |\tau(0) - 0| \leq |\tilde{F}(0)| + \|d.\tilde{F}\| \cdot \|d.\zeta\| \cdot |\tau(0)| =$
  $= |F(0)| + \|d.F\| \cdot \|d.\zeta\| \cdot |\tau(0)| \leq 10^{-3}p + \epsilon \cdot e^{2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}} \cdot \frac{1}{6}p \leq 10^{-2}p$

Since $|\tilde{F}(\zeta(0))|_\infty \le 10^{-2}p$, we get

$$|G(0)|_\infty \le 10^{-2}p + 10^{-1}q + \epsilon^{1/3}p < \min\{\frac{1}{6}p, \frac{1}{6}q\} (\because \frac{q}{p} \in [e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}, e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}]).$$

We also know

$$\|d.G\| \le \|d.\tilde{F}\| \cdot \|d.\zeta\| + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} \sqrt{1 + \|d.\tilde{F}\|^2} \cdot \|d.\zeta\| < 2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

It follows that for all ϵ small enough: $G[R_{\frac{2}{3}p}(0)] \subset R_{2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}\frac{2}{3}p+\frac{1}{6}p}(0) \subset R_{\frac{2}{3}p}(0)$. We can now show that $|V^u(x,Z) \cap V^s(y,Z')| \ge 1$:

$V^s(y,Z')$ can be represented as $\psi_{y_0}[\{(t, H(t)) : |t|_\infty \le q_0^s\}]$. By admissibility, $H(0) < 10^{-3}q, \|d.H\| < \epsilon$. So as before: $H[R_{\frac{2}{3}p}(0)] \subset R_{\frac{2}{3}p}(0)$. It follows that $H \circ G$ is a contraction of $R_{\frac{2}{3}q}(0)$ to itself ($\mathrm{Lip}(H \circ G) \le \mathrm{Lip}(H) \cdot \mathrm{Lip}(G) \le 2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot \epsilon$). Such a function has a unique fixed point s_0 s.t. $H \circ G(s_0) = s_0$. It is easy to see that $\psi_{y_0}((G(s_0), s_0))$ belongs to $V^u(x,Z) \cap V^s(y,Z')$.

Next we claim that $V^u(x,Z) \cap V^s(y,Z')$ contains at most one point: Extend G and H to ϵ-Lipschitz functions $\tilde{G}$ and $\tilde{H}$ on A [HU80] where $A := R' \cup R_{q_0^s}(0)$. We saw: $\mathrm{Rad}_{\|\cdot\|_\infty}(R') < 2q < 2q_0^s$, whence $A \subset R_{2q_0^s}(0)$. We also know $|\tilde{G}(0)|_\infty < \frac{1}{6}q \le \frac{1}{6}q_0^s$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(G) < 2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}$, thus $\tilde{G}[A] \subset \tilde{G}[R_{2q_0^s}(0)] \subset R_{2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot 2q_0^s + \frac{1}{6}q_0^s}(0) \subset R_{q_0^s}(0) \subset A$. Also $|\tilde{H}(0)|_\infty < 10^{-3}q_o^s$, so $\tilde{H} : A \to A$ by similar calculations. It follows that $\tilde{H} \circ \tilde{G}$ is a contraction of A into itself, and therefore it has a unique fixed point. Every point in $V^u(x,Z) \cap V^s(y,Z')$ takes the form $\psi_{y_0}((G(s), s))$ where $s \in R'$ and $s = H \circ G(s) \equiv \tilde{H} \circ \tilde{G}(s)$. Since the equation $\tilde{H} \circ \tilde{G}(s) = s$ has at most one solution in A, it has at most one solution in R'. It follows that $|V^u(x,Z) \cap V^s(y,Z')| \le 1$. □

3.1.3. *The symbolic Markov property.*

Proposition 3.1.9. *If $x = \pi((v_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}})$, where $v \in \Sigma^\#$, then $f[W^s(x, Z(v_0))] \subset W^s(f(x), Z(v_1))$ and $f^{-1}[W^u(f(x), Z(v_1))] \subset W^u(x, Z(v_0))$*

Proof. See proposition 10.9 in [Sar13].

□

Lemma 3.1.10. *Suppose $Z, Z' \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $Z \cap Z' \neq \phi$, then:*

(1) If $Z = Z(\psi_{x_0}^{p_0^s, p_0^u})$ and $Z' = Z(\psi_{y_0}^{q_0^s, q_0^u})$ then $Z \subset \psi_{y_0}[R_{q_0^s \wedge q_0^u}(0)]$

(2) For any $x \in Z \cap Z'$: $W^u(x,Z) \subset V^u(x,Z')$ and $W^s(x,Z) \subset V^s(x,Z')$

Proof. Fix some $x \in Z \cap Z'$. Write $x = \pi(v), x = \pi(w)$ where $v, w \in \Sigma^\#$ satisfy $w_0 = \psi_{x_0}^{p_0^s, p_0^u}$ and $w_0 = \psi_{y_0}^{q_0^s, q_0^u}$. Write $p := p_0^s \wedge p_0^u, q := q_0^s \wedge q_0^u$. Since $\pi(v) = \pi(w)$ we have by theorem 2.1.14 $\frac{p}{q} \in [e^{-\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}, e^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}]$ and

$$\psi_{y_0}^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_0} = O + a + \Delta \text{ on } R_\epsilon(0)$$

Where O is an orthogonal transformation, a is a constant vector s.t. $|a| < 10^{-1}q$ and $\Delta : R_\epsilon(0) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $\Delta(0) = 0$, $\|d.\Delta\| < \epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}$ (and hence also $|\Delta(u)| \le \epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}|u|$ for all $u \in R_\epsilon(0)$). Recall that all vector norms are infinity norms, and all operators norms are calculated w.r.t to infinity norms.

Every point in Z is the intersection of a u-admissible and an s-admissible manifolds in $\psi_{x_0}^{p_0^s, p_0^u}$, therefore Z is contained in $\psi_{x_0}[R_{10^{-2}p}(0)]$ (proposition 1.3.13). Thus

$$Z \subset \psi_{y_0}[(\psi_{y_0}^{-1} \circ \psi_{x_0})[R_{10^{-2}p}(0)] \subset \psi_{y_0}[R_{(1+\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}})10^{-2}p}(a)] \subset$$

$$\subset \psi_{y_0}[R_{(1+\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}})10^{-2}p+10^{-1}q}(0)] \subset \psi_{y_0}[B_{(1+\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}})10^{-2}qe^{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}+10^{-1}q}(0)] \subset \psi_{y_0}[R_q(0)] \ (\because \epsilon < 1).$$

This proves the first statement of the lemma. Next we show $W^s(x,Z) \subset V^s(x,Z')$: Write $v_i = \psi_{x_i}^{p_i^s, p_i^u}$ and $w_i = \psi_{y_i}^{q_i^s, q_i^u}$. Since $\pi(v) = x$ and $Z = Z(v_0)$, the symbolic Markov property gives us:

$$f^k[W^s(x,Z)] \subset W^s(f^k(x), Z(v_k)) \ (k \ge 0).$$

The sets $Z(v_k)$ and $Z(w_k)$ intersect, because they both contain $f^k(x)$. By the first part of the lemma, $Z(v_k) \subset \psi_{y_k}[R_{q_k^s \wedge q_k^u}(0)]$. It follows that

$$f^k[W^s(x,Z)] \subset \psi_{y_k}[R_{q_k^s \wedge q_k^u}(0)] \subset \psi_{y_k}[R_{Q_\epsilon(y_k)}(0)]$$

for all $k \ge 0$. By proposition 1.3.20(4): $W^s(x,Z) \subset V^s((w_i)_{i\ge 0}) \equiv V^s(x,Z')$ □

The effort of this work was aimed at recreating Sarig's results for our generalized set up. Specifically, after proving the string of claims up until lemma 3.1.10, we were able to show all of the assumptions and claims Sarig's work is based on (up until [Sar13] Part 3, chapter 11- A countable Markov Partition). The claims that are left to show for our work can be found in Sarig's work (i.e., as of Part 3, chapter 11- A countable Markov Partition), with the same notations, and all preliminaries identical.

References

[Aar97] J. Aaronson. *An Introduction to Infinite Ergodic Theory*. Mathematical surveys and monographs. American Mathematical Society, 1997.

[AW67] R. L. Adler and B. Weiss. Entropy, a complete metric invariant for automorphisms of the torus. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 57:1573–1576, 1967.

[AW70] Roy L. Adler and Benjamin Weiss. *Similarity of automorphisms of the torus*. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 98. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1970.

[Bow70] Rufus Bowen. Markov partitions for Axiom A diffeomorphisms. *Amer. J. Math.*, 92:725–747, 1970.

[Bow71] Rufus Bowen. Periodic points and measures for Axiom *A* diffeomorphisms. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 154:377–397, 1971.

[Bow73] Rufus Bowen. Symbolic dynamics for hyperbolic flows. *Amer. J. Math.*, 95:429–460, 1973.

[Bow78] Rufus Bowen. *On Axiom A diffeomorphisms*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1978. Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, No. 35.

[Bow08] Rufus Bowen. *Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms*, volume 470 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, revised edition, 2008. With a preface by David Ruelle, Edited by Jean-René Chazottes.

[BP01] L. Barreira and Ya. Pesin. Hlder continuity of invariant distributions, in lectures on Lyapunov exponents and smooth ergodic theory. In *Smooth ergodic theory and its applications (Seattle, WA, 1999)*, volume 69 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 3–106. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001. Appendix A by M. Brin and Appendix B by D. Dolgopyat, H. Hu and Pesin.

[BP07] Luis Barreira and Yakov Pesin. *Nonuniform hyperbolicity*, volume 115 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007. Dynamics of systems with nonzero Lyapunov exponents.

[BS81] L. A. Bunimovich and Ya. G. Sinaĭ. Markov partitions for dispersed billiards. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 78(2):247–280, 1980/81.

[Buz09] Jérôme Buzzi. Maximal entropy measures for piecewise affine surface homeomorphisms. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 29(6):1723–1763, 2009.

[FS79] A Fathi and M Shub. Some dynamics of pseudo-anosov diffeomorphisms. *Asterisque*, 66(67):181–207, 1979.

[HU80] J.-B. Hiriart-Urruty. Extension of Lipschitz functions. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 77(2):539–554, 1980.

[Kat80] A. Katok. Lyapunov exponents, entropy and periodic orbits for diffeomorphisms. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, 51:137–173, 1980.

[Kat84] Anatole Katok. Nonuniform hyperbolicity and structure of smooth dynamical systems. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Warsaw, 1983)*, pages 1245–1253. PWN, Warsaw, 1984.

[Kat07] Anatole Katok. Fifty years of entropy in dynamics: 1958–2007. *J. Mod. Dyn.*, 1(4):545–596, 2007.

[KM95] Anatole Katok and Leonardo Mendoza. *Dynamical systems with non-uniformly hyperbolic behavior, Supplement to Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems*, volume 54 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[Lc] Y. Lima and Matheus c. Symbolic dynamics for non-uniformly hyperbolic surface maps with discontinuities. preprint on webpage at `http://www.math.u-psud.fr/~ylima/`.

[LS] Y. Lima and O. Sarig. Symbolic dynamics for three dimensional flows with positive topological entropy. preprint on webpage at `http://www.wisdom.weizmann.ac.il/~sarigo/`.

[McS34] E. J. McShane. Extension of range of functions. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 40(12):837–842, 1934.

[Per29] Oskar Perron. Über Stabilität und asymptotisches Verhalten der Lösungen eines Systems endlicher Differenzengleichungen. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 161:41–64, 1929.

[Per30] Oskar Perron. Die Stabilitätsfrage bei Differentialgleichungen. *Math. Z.*, 32(1):703–728, 1930.

[Pes76] Ja. B. Pesin. Families of invariant manifolds that correspond to nonzero characteristic exponents. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 40(6):1332–1379, 1440, 1976.

[Rat69] M. E. Ratner. Markov decomposition for an U-flow on a three-dimensional manifold. *Mat. Zametki*, 6:693–704, 1969.

[Rat73] M. Ratner. Markov partitions for Anosov flows on n-dimensional manifolds. *Israel J. Math.*, 15:92–114, 1973.

[Sar13] Omri M. Sarig. Symbolic dynamics for surface diffeomorphisms with positive entropy. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 26(2):341–426, 2013.

[Sin68a] Ja. G. Sinaĭ. Construction of Markov partitionings. *Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen.*, 2(3):70–80 (Loose errata), 1968.

[Sin68b] Ja. G. Sinaĭ. Markov partitions and U-diffeomorphisms. *Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen*, 2(1):64–89, 1968.

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Weizmann Institute of Science, POB 26, Rehovot, 76100 ISRAEL
E-mail address: `snir.benovadia@weizmann.ac.il`